

IS UNIVERSALISM TRUE?

OR,

UNIVERSALISM VERSUS CHRIST.

---

A PUBLIC DISCUSSION,

PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED IN THE AKRON SUNDAY GAZETTE,

BY JOHN F. ROWE,

EDITOR AMERICAN CHRISTIAN REVIEW, AND

REV. E. L. REXFORD, D.D.,

PRESIDENT OF BUCHEL COLLEGE.

---

AKRON, OHIO:  
PRINTED BY THE BEACON PUBLISHING COMPANY.

1879.

HISTORICAL SOCIETY  
SOUTH  
SEE 37212

R154  
R878  
c.2

## THE HELL OF THE FUTURE.

### PREFACE.

The discussion which is published in this pamphlet may appear somewhat irregular and disjointed to the reader, but when he comes to read the discussion through he will discover the reason why. After Dr. Rexford retired from the contest, other anonymous parties entered the arena, to whom allusion is made in some of my rejoinders. There were no less than five respondents after Dr. Rexford closed his part of the discussion. Of course it was impossible for me to notice all these, or even one of them, before completing the line of argument I had mapped out. Some of these I should have noticed in the end if the managers of the *Gazette* had permitted the discussion to go on. The certificate of the Elders of the Church of Christ, as well as the article of C. C. Smith, Pastor of the Church, which appear in place and under proper date, will explain themselves. The reader will notice that after Dr. Rexford retired, I did not, as in duty bound, follow him up, or make any reference to him, but, on the contrary, pursued my own line of argument to the end, and which I did at the earnest request of many of our citizens who evinced great anxiety to hear more upon the distinctive features of Universalism.

JOHN F. ROWE.

AKRON, OHIO, Sept. 1, 1879.

*To the Editor of the Sunday Gazette:*

SIR: In the last issue of the *Gazette* (April 20th), I read the following notice of a sermon delivered by Dr. Rexford, of this city. Allow me to propound a few questions to the erudite Doctor, and, if possible, induce him to answer some inquiries growing out of the propositions he has submitted to the public. We presume the following to be correct in statement:

"Dr. Rexford, in his sermon at the Academy of Music on last Sabbath, on 'The Resurrection to Life and the Resurrection to Damnation,' said that if the hell of the future would be remorse of conscience, as is now commonly supposed, it cannot be endless, for the reason that remorse of conscience is a proof of spiritual restoration. If all who have sinned, are to be visited with such suffering, it is one of the most convincing arguments in favor of all such being saved. He held that completeness of retribution is possible only on the supposition of completeness of restoration."

The Doctor says that "if all who have sinned are to be visited with such suffering [remorse of conscience], it is one of the most convincing arguments in favor of all such being saved." And so remorse of conscience is here given as proof of the final salvation of all men. Please tell us in the Bible where it is recorded, that those who die in their sins shall suffer remorse of conscience as a penalty. Is not this a mere assumption? The particular kind of "suffering" is not indicated in the Bible. If, as the apostle Paul informs us, some men's "consciences are seared *as with a hot iron*," and that some in this life are "*past feeling*," and in this condition pass into the next world, as multitudes do, how, we are anxious to know, reasoning from the knowable to the unknowable, can these suffer remorse of conscience? As nothing stands still, either in mind or matter, and as rational beings are progressing or retrogressing, the good, by exercise, growing better, and the wicked, by exercise, growing worse; the Doctor would confer a small favor on us, by showing how a wicked man passing into the future, and growing wickeder as he progresses, can be suddenly stopped in his career, and be made to suffer remorse of conscience. It can only be done on the principle of physical compulsion, and since God does not operate on sentient beings by physical means, nor change the moral nature of man by irresistible power—which would destroy the freedom of the will, and leave man a machine—we are forced to the conclusion that if a man dies incorrigibly wicked, he continues on in that wicked state, impelled by his own free choice.

Again, if "completeness of restoration" depends on "completeness of retribution, then all such are saved, not only without the mercy of God, but actually without the mediation of Christ. This doctrine renders the blood of Christ absolutely inefficient and inefficacious. The mediatorship of Christ is wholly nullified. Vicarious sacrifice is a myth. Christ is an imposter. Salvation through the Gospel is a delusion and a snare. The mercy of God is entirely expelled. Christ

is not the Son of God, except in the sense of a great moral hero, who died a martyr to the truth in no higher sense than did Socrates.

If man pays the *full penalty* of God's violated law, then, in that case, the attribute of mercy is entirely excluded from the divine government, and absolute justice prevails supreme. If complete retribution belongs to the divine arrangement then there remains no place for the exercise of mercy. Of course, on this principle, there was no need that Christ should die for the sins of the world, and the New Testament doctrine—that the resurrection of Christ brought life and immortality to light, is not found in the theology of Dr. Rexford. Will he shoulder the responsibility? If he denies the doctrine of the atonement, he denies by moral necessity the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. Hence he is only a moralist, and not a Christian.

If a criminal is sent to the penitentiary to meet the full penalty of violated law, and *works out*, on the strictest principles of justice, the full measure of the crime, and afterwards is liberated, but only by the extreme limit of the criminal law, he goes out without thanking anybody, and obtains his pardon without the intervention of mercy. It is an exhibition of the very severest kind of justice, and yet, without this underlying principle of justice, no government could stand any length of time. But if the Governor reprieves the culprit before the time of his sentence expires, then we see an exhibition of mercy. The attributes of justice always, in every form of government, precedes the attribute of mercy. If men will not receive the mercy of God through Jesus Christ, they must remain under the displeasure of God; remain under his condemnation, sold under sin, and the wrath of God abides upon them. Will Dr. Rexford tell us *when* this wrath will be removed, if it is not removed by the blood of Christ in this life?

Again, if suffering is only intended for discipline, and not for punishment; and if sufficient suffering will fit a sinner for the honor of sonship in the family of God, without the intervention of Christ, who died to make the law of God honorable; then, on that principle, after a criminal has served his *full time* in the penitentiary, Dr. Rexford will be obliged to receive that convict, made free by the limitation of his penalty, into his family, to become the honored associate of his wife and daughters. Why not? Has not this convict wiped out, by "paying his way," all the shame and dishonor of his crime? Here, methinks, is a principle of government involved which we fear this champion of Universalism has not yet fathomed.

Once more: My *feelings* prompt me to disbelieve in the doctrine of eternal punishment. But I am troubled about the *facts* in the case. I submit the following rule of Bible interpretation as it relates to the Greek term *aion*: The terms "everlasting," "forever," "eternal," etc., are uniformly used in the Scriptures to denote the *largest possible duration of which the subject to which they are applied is applicable*. Thus, a "servant for ever" (Sam. 27:12) is a servant during life; "an ordinance for ever" (Num. 10:8) is an ordinance which continues during the entire dispensation of which it is a part. So the "everlasting hills," and "everlasting mountains," recorded in the Bible (Gen. 49:26; Heb. 3:6), are hills and mountains which continue to the end of all material things, or as long as it is possible they should continue; and who knows that even the everlasting hills shall be destroyed? According to this rule

of interpretation the terms "everlasting" and "for ever" when applied to things in the future world—to the rewards of the righteous as well as to the punishment of the wicked—must denote absolute eternity, if it denotes anything at all. The longest duration which will then be possible, the longest which may be predicated of the enjoyments of the righteous and the sufferings of the wicked, will certainly be eternal, if we can depend on the meaning of language. As regards the Greek word *aion*, I have this to say, that when governed by the preposition *eis*, in which connection it is always used when applied to the future punishment of the wicked, it invariably conveys the idea of endless duration. It is used in this construction in fifty-six places of Griesbach's edition of the New Testament. In our common edition it is found in four or five other instances. In six places it is applied to future punishment. In the remaining fifty-four it undeniably expresses endless duration. But if in fifty-four cases it is used in the endless sense, will Dr. Rexford please give one reason why the same meaning should not be applied to these six instances where it is applied to future punishment? The adjective *aionios*, "everlasting," is used seventy-one times in the New Testament; and, excepting the five in which it is applied to future punishment, it unquestionably denotes endless duration. Why is it not, then, just as necessary as it is reasonable to believe that in these five cases it means endless duration? Will Dr. Rexford furnish us an exceptional rule? The expression *eis tous aionas ton aionon*, commonly rendered "for ever and ever," is used eighteen times in the New Testament. In fifteen instances it is applied to the continuance of glory, perfection, government and praise of God. In one it is used to represent the future happiness of the righteous; and in the other two it is applied to the future punishment of the wicked. Will Dr. Rexford deny that it does also mean endless duration in these two instances? If not, why not?

Now as the same Greek word, *aionon*, (Matt. 24:46), represents "everlasting punishment" as well as "eternal life," will the Doctor inform the reading public by what law of critical exegesis he would shorten one member of the antithesis without shortening the other? I had always supposed that one side of an antithetical proposition was of the same length as the other. If black and white measure each other, so "eternal life" measures "everlasting punishment."

Once more. I would like to know on what principle of God's moral government, Dr. Rexford will save a sinner from eternal punishment who dies in an impenitent *state*. If man is in a *state* of sin, under sentence of eternal death—which is the Scriptural argument throughout—and dies despising the Gospel and cursing God, by what means, beyond the present period of reconciliation, as well as beyond the grave, will this incorrigible sinner be eternally saved? You say eternal punishment is unreasonable and unworthy of God. How can a finite mind know? The question is this: Must not the measure of God's *punishment* be the measure of God's *justice*? And who will presume to measure the justice of the infinite God? What was the measure of Christ's atonement? Was it a finite or an infinite atonement? If finite, then the punishment of sin may be limited; if infinite, then who dare say that punishment may not be eternal? If a man die in a *state* of sin, and no provision is made in the Gospel for

man in a state of sin beyond the grave, Dr. Rexford will enlighten many eyes by letting us know how this is to be consummated. Light! Light!  
LAICUS.

## DOES THE BLOOD OF CHRIST CLEANSE FROM SIN?

To the Editor of the Gazette:

SIR: Since I prepared my first article for your columns, I have read the "Ganter-Rexford Correspondence," in which I find some sentiments expressed by Dr. Rexford of such a character as not only to perplex, but to alarm me. On pp. 31, 32, I find these words: "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin." Yes, I believe that, and so do you. And I venture that I shall have the verdict of every intelligent Christian in Akron in favor of the thought I shall give concerning it. I ask you: Do you then believe that it is the literal, physical, corporeal red blood of Jesus that cleanses from sin?—the blood that could flow out of the wounds? Do you then believe it is that literal blood? I venture to say you believe no such statement. In place of this I venture with equal confidence to say that you believe it is the love of Christ, his mercy, his spirit altogether that saves us from sin, and that by our accepting that Spirit and living in obedience to its law."

I am one of the *non*-intelligent persons in Akron who believes that "without shedding of blood (the blood of Jesus, the Sacrificial Lamb) is no remission," Heb. ix. 22. If we are not saved by the blood of Christ, will Dr. Rexford, in the capacity of a theologian and literateur, explain to the non-intelligent portion of this community what Paul means by such expressions as these: "Through faith in his blood" Rom. 3:25; "being now justified by his blood" Rom. 5:9; "communion of the blood of Christ" (I Cor. 10:16); "the new testament in my blood" (I Cor. 11:25); "have redemption through his blood" Eph. 1:7; "having made peace through the blood of his cross" Col. 1:20; "for if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God" (Heb. 9:13); and other passages in this epistle, such as "sanctify the people with his own blood," "through the blood of the everlasting covenant;" together with many other similar passages in the several epistles.

Now I do not believe in the *literal* application of the blood of Christ; but what I want to know is this—Does Dr. Rexford believe that the principles of the divine government demanded the blood of Christ in order that the way of salvation might be opened up to a world resting under the condemnation of God? Paul says, "In

whom we have redemption *through his blood*, even the forgiveness of sins" (Col. 1:14.) If it is not the "literal blood of Jesus that cleanses from sin," then what kind of blood is it? *Figurative* blood! Did Christ shed *figurative* blood? If so, on what fact was the figure founded? Is not this nebulous to emanate from a Doctor of Divinity? The apostle John says, "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin;" and yet Dr. Rexford contradicts this principle of the remedial scheme of salvation, by boldly declaring: "I abide by the sentiments of my sermon, and urge the probability, and the certainty of my own belief, that there will be for the soul of sin a retribution beyond death, merciful, and just and helpful, which *no blood of Christ can prevent*, and which it *never was designed to prevent*." It is well that in this anti-apostolic sentiment the Doctor was cautious enough to use the words "probability," and "*my own belief*." We are glad that the "probability" of a thing, and the Doctor's "*own belief*," do not dogmatically make an assertion true. If the doctrine promulgated by Dr. Rexford be true, then the blood of Christ, which sealed the "New Covenant"—the antitype of the "Old Covenant" which was sealed by the blood of animal victims—represents only a farce, and sacrifice is but a figment of the fancy. If Dr. Rexford is right, (and I think he is radically and fatally wrong), then these words of Christ have no meaning: "Verily, verily I say to you, Except you eat of the flesh of the Son of man, (by faith in his sacrifice?) and *drink his blood*, (by faith in his atonement?) you *have no life in you*," John vi. 53. In the same connection we read: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; (not *up from the earth*) if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." But from the following words of Dr. R. I must believe that he is a moralist, a deist, and not a Christian: "I believe in salvation through repentance and faith. If a person repents of his sins and turns away from them in spirit, he is saved from those sins, it is true, and his heaven neither in this world or (nor in?) the next is the place into which he goes, but rather the experience of joy which is his, by virtue of his being like God, just, merciful, and holy, the experience in fact that is determined by the measure of his adjustment to the divine orders of life." Page 20.

I am curious to know what the Doctor means, when he says: "If a person repents of his sins, or turns away from them *in spirit*." I had always supposed that when a man turned away from his sins, he turned away from them *in deed and in fact*. I would like to see a man pay his taxes *in spirit*, and not *in fact*. I would like to see soldiers go to war *in spirit*, and not *in fact*. I would like to see a child obey its parents *in spirit* but not in overt acts of obedience. I would like to see rebels throw down their weapons *in spirit*, and without doing so *in fact*. And yet in the closing sentence of the paragraph just quoted, he says that a man is saved by an "*experience in fact*, that is determined by *the measure of his adjustment* to the divine orders of life." Really I do not know what he means by "*orders of life*"—whether he means moral orders, or theistic orders, or Christian orders, or theocratic orders. But suppose the sinner, either in this life or in the life to come, refuses to go into this "*adjustment*," whatever it may be—What relation will he sustain to the pure and the holy God?

The Doctor says, "that the person who has lived in sin for years cannot at once adjust all this chaotic life to the divine standard." But if he lives on *in sin*, and refuses to "adjust" himself to the "divine standard," and dies *in sin* without the adjustment, then what? If "Christ's blood is not applied," in the "judgment" of Dr. Rexford, to the sinner that he may receive salvation, then it follows as a logical consequence that the world never was in need of a Savior, and is not now in need of one; and, as a second deduction from the premises, such a thing as a *remedial* scheme of salvation is a travestie upon the wisdom of God.

I would like, in all sincerity, to submit the following questions to Dr. Rexford:

1. Do you believe the Bible, or any portion of it, to be an inspired volume?
2. Do you believe the Bible, or any portion of it, to be supernaturally revealed?
3. Do you believe that Jesus Christ is "the Son of the living God"—the Logos that was "in the beginning"—"Immanuel" (God with us); that "by him were all things created;" that "without him was not anything made that was made;" and that "he is before all things, and that by him all things consist?"
4. Is Jesus Christ the author of eternal salvation?
5. Is salvation conditional or unconditional?
6. If "all the promises of God *in him* are yea, and *in him* Amen," can a man be saved who is *not* in him?
7. If a man "dies in his sins," how may we infallibly know that, in the far future, he will be delivered *from* his sins?
8. If "the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one who believes it," can a man, under the Gospel dispensation, be saved who wilfully rejects the Gospel?
9. Are mankind *in a state of sin*, and if so, does Christ redeem *from* a state of sin?
10. Does God pardon sinners, and if so, on what conditions?
11. Do you believe that mankind could have been saved without the advent and willing sacrifice of Christ?
12. Can you show, either by reason or revelation, how the penalty of sin could be removed without the death, resurrection, and glorification of Christ?

JOHN F. ROWE, *alias* LAICUS.

## DR. REXFORD'S POSITION.

To the Editor of the Gazette:

DEAR SIR: In the last two issues of your paper I find a criticism of certain sentiments I have advanced, both in sermons and in correspondence. I find also a criticism of other sentiments which I have not advanced, but which are supposed by many to be entertained by

the Universalist denomination. There is little or no lingering over any special questions by my critic, but the whole field of Theology seems to have been rapidly sketched, as though the purpose were to survey the ground rather than stop to cultivate some particular portion of it to test its productiveness. It is very unsatisfactory to me to adopt this hurried method. I should much prefer to consider one question at a time, and yet to do this with each question that has been raised, would consume more of my time than I can at present devote to such work, while the *Gazette* would probably find the work occupying too much of its valuable space. The criticism with which the articles commenced was briefly passed upon my claim that remorse of conscience indicates a reviving life in the soul. This thought is dismissed with a brief paragraph indicating that the Scriptures nowhere state that such remorse is the penalty for sins committed. Had my critic read carefully the paragraph which contained my thought he would have seen that I held this language, viz: "If the hell of the future would be remorse of conscience *as is commonly supposed*," etc. I am quite confident that this is the common opinion among people who believe in endless punishment. I know of no one who holds now to the early supposition that hell is a lake of fire and brimstone, or that future torment is inflicted by any physical agents. My critic may hold to this ancient opinion, though I have no means of knowing this fact if it so be. In the sermon which contained the paragraph criticised, I held that some men seem to continue in sin till their consciences are hardened. They become to all appearances insensible to all guilt or remorse. For such I held that remorse of conscience would be impossible except upon a quickening or a revival or a resurrection of the spiritual nature. If such are ever to remain thus hardened they will forever be strangers to the torments of another world *if the torments be from remorse*. I held that the eternal deadness of the soul could not be attended with eternal suffering. Holding further that the Bible teaches the resurrection of all souls both good and evil (John 5:28), it was urged that a condition of spiritual suffering is preferable to a condition of insensibility, inasmuch as the suffering indicates an increased volume of life, and you cannot affirm the suffering only as you affirm *more life*, and *increased life* is the hope of the world. This position was illustrated so far as it can be illustrated by physical analogies, by the portions of the body in its possible experiences. A person, for instance, comes very near to death by freezing. The pain of this misfortune is experienced at first, but soon ceases. After the first severe chill, the body is benumbed and the victim is unconscious. The currents of life run so low that there is not left enough vitality to produce suffering. We commence the process of restoration and the patient will tell us that when life began to revive, then the suffering commenced, and were a skilled physician to take note of the patient he would hail the first sign of pain as the first sign of restoring life. We press upon a nerve in the arm till we say the hand is "asleep." It seems for a time entirely dead. At length a prickling sensation is experienced and we say it is a sign of the restoration of the nervous forces to their normal condition. The Prodigal Son went away from home with joy, he returned with great sorrow, but his returning way was the better way, though he was wet with his tears of distress. If a mother were to watch, with infinite grief, the

downward steps of her son, her hope of his recovery would sink in her heart as she should take note of the decaying sensibility—the gradual steeling of his soul against all pain. She has lost hope as his conscience has hardened into oblivion to remorse over his sins. Hope has been dead in her heart for years possibly, but she goes into his room, it may be unexpected by him, and she finds him in distress. He is walking the floor and giving every sign of sorrow. But what is her experience in such a discovery? Every tear he sheds is to her heart as so much rain upon a withered and barren field. Her hope revives before the spectacle of his sorrow. She encourages her heart with the assurance that there is life and the capability of suffering in his soul. She hails every tear with relief and hope, for it is to her a sign of restoring life. “He was dead, but is alive again.” He is nearer God in his sorrow than he was in his insensibility, and to be nearer God, even in pain, is to be possessed of more life.

I believe this law holds good in all relations where life has been injured so as to become insensible, or through evil of any kind, has suffered a diminished volume of vital activity—the law that pain shall be incident to restoration, that restoration can not be without pain—that the pain is proof of the restoring life.

If there be an exception to this, that can be expanded into a law, I shall certainly be interested in its discovery. I have sought for it, not for controversy, but for truth, but have not found it, and as an element or factor in the product of my faith I certainly regard it as too important to be set aside by a single paragraph. The force of the suggestion I am aware is to be felt chiefly on the supposition that the suffering of the future is to be spiritual—a supposition which I observe my critic questions. I hold, however, that it is a current opinion among “Evangelical” Christians, so called, that the torment of the future world for the sinner will be remorse of conscience. And I hold, likewise, that just remorse can not be experienced except upon the quickened life of the sufferer. “Confirmed in sin” and “remorse of conscience” do not go together. The remorse is experienced after the purpose to sin is abandoned.

My critic asks me how long this suffering will continue. I do not presume to say. No one can tell. The analogies, however, would suggest somewhat as follows: Pain ceases in one of two conditions. It ceases in perfect death—it ceases in a condition of perfect life. Physical pain ceases in this process of restoration only when the currents of life flow completely in the channels God ordained for them. When life is complete the suffering is at an end.

If we admit that the Bible teaches the resurrection of all souls—I assume that few, if any, intelligent people in our day hold to the resurrection of the literal physical body—this fortune of suffering must be experienced by the sinful in the process of that resurrection, while the good, who are only comparatively so, will go forth into life more immediately or more directly, though there are few if any, it seems to me, who, in the rising fortunes of their life, will not feel a sense of sorrow over the evil that has been. No one is perfect, and this business of heaven-making is not transacted, in my judgment, with any borrowed capital. A man’s real experience of joy in this universe, as well as his experience of sorrow, must depend, spiritually, upon what he has been and is.

The paragraph in the *Gazette* which is criticised but too briefly, was from a sermon preached on the subject of the resurrection. It is a common belief among Christian people that all souls will be resurrected. To me this means an uplifted life at last for all. In whatever condition souls may be, the universal resurrection is a doctrine of the general Christian public. In this resurrection all experiences of joy and sorrow are embraced—a sorrow with the joy of hope breaking ever and anon through its gloom, and slowly changing all fortunes into recognized and experienced good.

From this subject of conscience, my critic passes to numerous other questions, which I do not at present propose to consider. It is practically useless to spend time in this hurried method, depending on the traditional sound of words for their meaning.

As a comprehensive answer to the attempted argument in favor of endless punishment from the character of the word *aionios*, I submit the fact that many of the early Church Fathers who wrote in the Greek language and who taught the doctrine of the ultimate restoration of all souls, employed precisely the same language in describing punishment as is found in Matt. XXV. 46. And one of them especially speaks of souls being purified and saved by what my critic would call the endless fires of hell.

ATONEMENT.

For my opinions as to the atonement in general, I refer my critic to the correspondence that passed between Rev. Mr. Ganter and myself. I have not changed my thought since that time, unless it be that I am all the more convinced of its essential correctness.

The several questions raised in the last article I should answer in the main probably just as my critic would answer them. There is little or no controversy possible regarding them. No Universalist of whom I know holds that any soul will ever be saved without accepting the conditions of salvation. The Universalist faith is that all souls will at last accept those conditions. If it should be a fact that some souls will not ultimately accept them, I should believe as all other Universalists would, that such souls will be eternally miserable, unless God, seeing their unfitness to exist, should think best to strike them out of existence. I think this would be the final action, for if a soul is not worth saving, it is not worth damning. Is it?

Yours truly,

E. L. REXFORD.

GOD'S MERCY NOT SEEN IN THE VICARIOUS SACRIFICE  
OF CHRIST.

To the Editor of the *Gazette*:

DEAR SIR: I find Mr. Rowe objecting to the doctrine of complete retribution on the ground that it gives no place for the exercise of the divine mercy. He says: “If complete retribution belongs to the

divine arrangement, then there remains no place for the exercise of mercy. Of course, on this principle, there was no need that Christ should die for the sins of the world." Again he says, speaking of the wrath of God: "Will Dr. Rexford tell us when this wrath will be removed if it is not removed by the blood of Christ in this life?" In this thought my critic is seen to occupy the common ground of the sacrificial theology, arguing that God manifests a great mercy in the sacrifice of Christ. It has been held ever since the days of Archbishop Anselm that the death of Jesus was a satisfaction accomplished and accepted as a substitute for the endless suffering of the whole world. His blood was the price paid for our release from the eternal agonies of hell. Hence the song:

"Jesus paid it all, all the debt I owe."

The people sing of the mercy of God through Jesus Christ. "The amazing mercy"—"the transcendent love"—"the abounding tenderness" of God are evermore upon the lips of the people. And all these amiable qualities in the divine nature many good people think to discover in the spectacle of Christ's death as a substituted agony in the place of the world's suffering.

The original demand of justice was, that on account of the sin of Adam the whole human family should suffer forever, if we except perhaps the small number of the "elect" provided for by the caprice of Calvinism. Here was the doom of the race. It was averted by Christ appearing as a substitute. And when it is asked how Christ being one person, could suffer all that the whole race would suffer forever, it is answered that he being infinite, could suffer as much, and did suffer, in his death as much as the whole human family could suffer for an eternity. If the term of suffering was lessened, its intensity was increased, and hence the product was undiminished. So much agony was due the divine law, and it was provided and endured by Christ. And this is called the "amazing mercy of God!" I undertake to say it is no exhibition of God's mercy whatever. What moving of the divine will is here seen toward a more helpful attitude? What giving over of any claim of an imaginary or so-called justice? Is there any diminishing of the final result of suffering? Is the pain that was endured any less? The theory is that of substitution, and the whole weight of the divine blow falls undiminished. So far as the quality or mood of the divine mind is concerned it is not seen by this theory of interpretation that God yields one iota of the infinite "wrath." The equivalent is offered and accepted, and the whole thought is aggravated by the report that the divine justice (?) inflicted the misery on the innocent and permitted the guilty to escape! In this connection the wisdom and manifest justice of Solomon is in place: "He that justifieth the wicked and he that condemneth the just, even they both are an abomination to the Lord."

It may be said that it was a *mercy to the human race*, to have the penalty transferred to another. This is barely possible, but if this be the thought let it be so stated, and let the other judgment that Christ's retributive death show mercy on the part of God, be abandoned. It shows no mercy.

And here is another phase of this theory that needs an explanation: It is said that justice demands an infinite penalty. With man

to suffer it that infinity must extend to eternity. It can not be more than infinite—it can not be less. It can have no limit. Infinity has no bounds. How is it then that Christ's suffering has ceased? We cannot *add* to infinite suffering, but is it not easily comprehended that Christ's sufferings could be increased by extending his *time* of suffering? It ceases, and thus it has its limitations, and cannot then be infinite. The theory, it seems to me, does not hold firmly. It breaks at numerous points, and to me its essential perversion inheres in this, that penalty as a moral and positive infliction, should be transferred from a guilty to an innocent person.

It is not mercy to withhold a needed punishment from an offender, and much less is it a mercy to inflict it upon one who does not deserve it. It is a principle that will not work to advantage in ordinary affairs. If a child is sick, the physician does not claim that the aim and office of medical practice are accomplished when so much medicine is swallowed, indifferent as to who shall swallow it. The child is sick. The medicine is unpleasant. The patient dislikes it and perhaps is distressed at the thought of taking it. At this juncture a healthy and strong brother comes and says: "I will take it, and if your purpose is that so much bitter medicine shall be taken, give it to me and let the sick escape the nauseating drug." If the mother were inclined to be a practical and philosophical evangelical Christian making application of her religious belief, she would give the drug to the strong and healthy and allow the sufferer to "escape."

This whole theory starts from a wrong point. The object of government is not, that so much punishment shall be inflicted. It is for the benefit of the people that government exists and punishment is one of the aids to that general result. And when it is asked what punishment is just, it must be answered that which results in *obedience*, inasmuch as obedience to just laws is the highest good. God's mercy is not seen in cancelling just penalties. If a penalty is just, it ought to be inflicted. Its justice is measured by its benefits, and if the party needs it, it is injustice to withhold it. If the child needs the remedy however bitter, it is cruelty not to administer it. It is a loose and shambling theology that obliterates all moral discriminations and inflicts penalties of guilt upon the innocent, a theology that was born in an age before caprice had been banished by law. We repudiate it in practice and it were well if we were to banish this theologic phantom, which our living judgments and practices laugh to perpetual scorn.

My critic refers to the case of a criminal in the penitentiary. "If he remains through his whole term he serves the ends of justice; if he is pardoned by the Governor before his term expires he is an object of mercy." Let us inspect this comparison a moment. If the Governor pardons the criminal it is because some new light has been thrown upon the case, or some circumstances have served to modify the prisoners relation to the law. Suppose, however, no change has been developed, but all the elements remain as they were precisely at the time the sentence was passed. If the sentence was just at first, will my critic undertake to say that a pardon would be just? Pardon presupposes a changed circumstance, that did not appear in the beginning, but does Mr. Rowe suppose that God makes any mistakes, that he should need to amend his decision? We do not wish our God to appear as a trifler certainly. If the man be justly sentenced, and no

new facts are developed, the Governor would simply be doing a wrong to exercise the pardoning power.

Again, my critic suggests that after the criminal has served out his full term, I will be obliged, by my theory, to take him into my family and make him an associate for my wife and daughter.

In the divine method of deliverance from bonds, I should be most happy so to do. That method is, that men are delivered from bonds only when they are free from sin. So long as sin remains in the heart, there is imprisonment. And when by suffering and by all the persuasions that the infinite mercy has provided, a soul shall be pure, I should be most glad to welcome such an one, unless it should be that his purity should shame me for a yet possible bondage of my own.

Would Mr. Rowe object to the receiving of such a soul? The Scripture is: "Thou shalt by no means come out of the prison, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing." There is a divine law of "imprisonment for debt," and men are not free till they are *right* before all the divine laws. These laws ought to be kept and not cancelled, and while I believe in the blood of Christ, in its symbolism, I am shocked that any man in these days should insist upon its literal value in the economy of divine Providence. My critic says he does not believe in its *literal* application. Then let him cease plying me with questions, which spring only from the supposition of its literal application. We could find the traces of the literal blood of Atonement on the altars of the old Aztec deities and among the darkened souls of all time, where an angry God was worshipped. But it is time for us to wash our theological hands of this stain.

My critic draws many a startling conclusion from my rejection of the sacrificial or retributive death of Christ. If I do not accept it, that through the blood of Jesus the demands of Justice are cancelled, then "the Mediatorship of Christ is nullified." "Salvation through the gospel is a delusion and a snare"—"the Bible is no revelation," etc., etc. And to close with, I am "a Moralist and not a Christian."

But see how this appears. Because I do not accept the interpretations of various Christian doctrines, which it has pleased Mr. Rowe to accept, I am a repudiator of the gospel and am no Christian. I have no Christianity over which I am inclined to boast, but I had hoped that I believed in Christianity, in Jesus, in God, in the Revelation and the Mediatorship of Christ. I still have that feeling of a desired discipleship. And if intolerance and a want of a frank and generous liberty to think, must be killed out of the hearts of men by their own exhibition, so let them cease. I am negatively glad of every exhibition of the intolerant spirit in our day, for I know that the more it is seen the more it will hasten to its extinction. If Mr. Rowe wishes thus to help the cause of liberty, here is my left hand.

As for myself, I am willing a man should elect what interpretation of the Scripture he deems best, and if he should interpret some parts in a way different from my own, I shall not so diminish my own thought of Christianity, as to deny him the claim of a Christian. I may repudiate his conclusions, but I will not deny him standing ground on the broad field of Christian hope and endeavor.

If by the Mediatorship of Christ, my critic means that Christ stands between God and the world for the purpose of shielding the world from the wrath of God, and takes the blows of the divine vengeance upon himself, I am frank to say, I do not believe it. I do not read in the Bible that Jesus Christ came into this world to save us from God. There is another kind of mediatorship in which I profoundly believe. I believe that Jesus is the mediator between man and all that is above man, a mediator to help this world of humanity upward to all its possible fortunes of glory and strength and peace. I believe, moreover, that God, instead of meeting the struggling mass of humanity with the blinding bolts of Almighty wrath, welcomes all, and helps all with a Father's love. And I beg leave to say, what to the intelligent public there is no need of saying, that this faith is not the repudiation of the Bible or the Gospel, or Inspiration, or Mediatorship. It is, in my judgment, rather a better light in which to interpret these great oracles, which for so many generations have been returning so many unmeaning answers to the beseeching heart of the world.

I am yours truly,

May 20th, 1879.

E. L. REXFORD.

## THE HELL OF THE FUTURE.

*To the Editor of the Gazette:*

DEAR SIR: In your issue of May 18th I find "Dr. Rexford's Position" spread out before your readers. If it has proved to be as disappointing to your readers as it has proved to be disappointing to me, great must have been the disappointment. As the questions involved in the discussion are Bible questions, and therefore of vital importance, why does he undertake to beguile your readers with his opinions and assumptions instead of enlightening them, as they have the right to expect, with proof-texts from the Scriptures. Not one quotation does he make from the Bible, the only source of information we have on the questions of eternal life and eternal punishment, on heaven and hell, on death and future judgment. My opinions and my assumptions are worth just as much as his; no more, no less. His entire article is made up of broad and unsupported assertions. We had a right to expect more than mere speculations from so distinguished a Rabbi—the President of a college and a Doctor of Divinity! We want more tangible proofs than such expressions: "I believe" so and so, "it *appears* so to me," "it *seems* so to me," etc. He lays down a proposition without citing one Scripture in proof, and then undertakes, at the expense of the credulity of his readers to prove it by "physical analogies." Whoever heard before (among logicians) of proving a proposition by analogies! Where do you find that—in Whately? in Mill? in Hamilton?

Here is his proposition: "In the sermon which contained the paragraph criticised, I held that some men seem (*seem*, mark you) to

continue in sin till their consciences are hardened. They become to all appearances insensible to all guilt or remorse. For such I held that remorse of conscience would be impossible except upon a quickening or a revival or a resurrection of the spiritual nature." For fear we might do our respondent injustice, we here quote the connection :

"If such are ever to remain thus hardened they will forever be strangers to the torments of another world *if the torments be from remorse*. I held that the eternal deadness of the soul could not be attended with eternal suffering. Holding further that the Bible teaches the resurrection of all souls both good and evil (John 5:28) it was urged that a condition of spiritual suffering is preferable to a condition of insensibility, inasmuch as the suffering indicates an increased volume of life, and you cannot affirm the suffering only as you affirm *more life*, and *increased life* is the hope of the world."

Then, without the citation of one Scriptural argument, he proceeds to prove it by the case of a man who came very near freezing to death! In view of this sort of argumentation—this metaphysical *involution* and physical *evolution*—is it any wonder that we doubt Dr. Rexford's belief in Christianity as of supernatural origin, and that we submitted to him, categorically, the following questions, to which he has made no reply whatever: "Do you believe the Bible, or any portion of it, to be inspired? Do you believe the Bible, or any portion of it, to be supernaturally revealed?"

His scientific flourishes about the man who receives the "first severe chill," and whose "currents of life" run very low, may pass for very good rhetoric, but the argument we fail to see. This is what logicians call *ignoratio elenchi*—a misapprehension of the question in debate. We may not deny what he has to say about the processes of physical life and physical death, but we deny his inferences as touching the questions in debate.

He would convey the idea that the word "remorse" is a Scriptural term, and yet the word is not found in the entire New Testament. Nor is it found in the Old Testament, unless I am greatly mistaken. Nor is the expression "eternal darkness of the soul," found in the Bible; nor the expression "resurrection of all souls," nor the phrase "condition of spiritual suffering"; nor is the term, "remorse of conscience," found there. Now, if this is not throwing dust in the eyes of the people—if this is not darkening counsel—we do not know where to find an example. It may answer for tolerably good rhetoric, but, as to the argument, alas!

His deduction from his premises and his argument, that all men shall be made finally holy and happy, is couched in the following rhetorical parable:

"I believe this law holds good in all relations, where life has been injured so as to become insensible or through evil of any kind, has suffered a diminished volume of vital activity—the law that pain shall be incident to restoration, that restoration can not be without pain, that the pain is proof of the restoring life."

Now after that masterly deduction, that hasn't a speck of Scripture in it, let his admirers depart in peace, for they have seen the salvation of all flesh.

But as my worthy respondent does not wish to explore the "whole field of Theology," (and yet, mind you, he is an advertised teacher of Theology) but prefers rather to "consider one question at a time," (which is exactly the thing I myself desire) we will take up the propo-

sition found in my first article—"The Hell of the Future." Here is the Doctor's style of meeting my argument:

"As a comprehensive answer to the attempted argument in favor of endless punishment from the character of the word *aiónios*, I submit the fact that many of the early Church Fathers who wrote in the Greek language and who taught the doctrine of the ultimate restoration of all souls, employed precisely the same language in describing punishment as is found in Matt. XXV. 46. And one of them especially speaks of souls being purified and saved, by what my critic would call the endless fires of hell."

Well, we should think that was a "comprehensive answer!" That's an answer with a vengeance, isn't it? Come, Doctor, no dodging; it is neither manly nor scholarly to dodge. You presume too much, sir, if you suppose the citizens of a "city on seven hills" will be satisfied with your mere *ipse dixit*. The people of this community are accustomed to examine proofs that are homogeneous with the proposition. You magisterially point to the dreamy "Church Fathers," but fail to produce one witness from that herd of mystics. Do you fear your scholarship in quoting from them, the majority of whom, as you ought to know, were dreamy, speculative mystics. Why do you not meet my "attempted argument" with rebutting testimony? Why do you not quote the language of the Bible on a question of such vital importance? Mind you, this is not a mere question of rhetorical kite-flying, but a question of fact. Why do you not appeal to standard authorities on this question—to our most approved Greek lexicons, and to our most eminent philologists? Since your reserved, ministerial dignity will not allow you to notice my argument, as becomes the magnanimity of a high-toned and honorable disputant, allow me to reproduce it for the benefit of men seeking the truth:

I submit the following rule of Bible interpretation, as it relates to the Greek term *aión*: The terms "everlasting," "forever," "eternal," etc., are uniformly used in the Scriptures to denote the *largest possible duration of which the subject, to which they are applied, is applicable*. Thus a "servant forever," (Sam. 27:12) is a servant during life; "an ordinance for ever," (Num. 10:8) is an ordinance which continues during the entire dispensation of which it is a part. So the "everlasting hills and everlasting mountains" recorded in the Bible, (Gen. 49:26; Heb. 3:6,) are hills and mountains which continue to the end of all material things, or as long as it is possible they should continue; and who knows that even the everlasting hills shall be destroyed? According to this rule of interpretation, the terms "everlasting" and "for ever," when applied to things in the future world—to the reward of the righteous as well as to the punishment of the wicked—must denote absolute eternity, if it denotes anything at all. The longest duration which will then be possible, the longest which may be predicated of the enjoyments of the righteous and the sufferings of the wicked, will certainly be eternal, if we can depend on the meaning of the language. As regards the Greek word *aión*, I have this to say, that when governed by the preposition *eis* in which connection it is always used when applied to the future punishment of the wicked, it invariably conveys the idea of endless duration. It is used in this construction in fifty-six places of Griesbach's edition of the New Testament. In our common edition it is found in four or five other instances. In six places it is applied to future punishment. In the remaining fifty-four, it undeni-

ably expresses endless duration. But if in fifty-four cases it is used in the endless sense, will Dr. Rexford please give one reason why the same meaning should not be applied to these six instances, where it is applied to future punishment? The adjective *aionios*, "everlasting," is used seventy-one times in the New Testament; and, excepting the five in which it is applied to future punishment, it unquestionably denotes endless duration. Why is it not then just as necessary as it is reasonable to believe that in these five cases it means endless duration? Will Dr. Rexford furnish us an exceptional rule? The expression *eis tous aionas ton aionon*, commonly rendered "for ever and ever," is used eighteen times in the New Testament. In fifteen instances it is applied to the continuance of glory, perfection, government and praise of God. In one it is used to represent the future happiness of the righteous; and in the other two it is applied to the future punishment of the wicked. Will Dr. Rexford deny that it does also mean endless duration in these two instances? If not, why not?

Now as the same Greek word, *aionon*, (Matt. 25.46,) represents "everlasting punishment" as well as "eternal life," will the Doctor inform the reading public by what law of critical exegesis he would shorten one member of the antithesis without shortening the other? I had always supposed that one side of an antithetical proposition was of the same length as the other. If black and white measure each other, so "eternal life" measures "everlasting punishment."

Will his serene dignity pay attention to this "attempted argument?" After he disposes of this, or attempts to dispose of it, I bind myself to marshal to my support many such forces. I suggest, Doctor, that it would be more in harmony with good scholarship, and more in keeping with "the eternal fitness of things," that instead of *pointing* your clerical finger toward the mystic "Church Fathers," you would summon to your aid such standard authorities as Crabbe on *English Synonyms*, Webster, Worcester, Adam Clarke, Pickering, Donnegan, Robinson, Greenfield, Bullions, etc. Suppose you try your hand on these. Mind you, your reputation as a scholar, as well as your reputation as a rhetorician, is at stake.

When we get this question off our hands, then we shall be ready to take up, in logical order, the Atonement, the Divinity of Christ, and the Resurrection of the dead, besides kindred questions, such as "the conditions of salvation," and the ultimate happiness of all who here live in a state of sin, and die in a state of sin, and who, irreconciled to God in this world, pass into the next world under "the wrath of God." When we come to the proper place, we intend to show that Universalism is only a system of morality or deism, and that by rejecting the blood of Christ as the procuring cause of salvation, Jesus the Christ is utterly rejected as the Savior of the world. We also intend to show, if the controversy proceeds, that there is not one particle of God's mercy in the doctrine of Universalism. We also fondly anticipate, that when my respondent shall arrive at the proper place, he will prove, or rather attempt to prove, by the testimony of Scriptures, that "all souls will at last accept" the conditions of salvation. But, from this time forward, one thing at a time. Now, Doctor, erect your logical batteries, and return my fire; or, to change the figure, suppose we try the short sword exercise.

The Doctor's closing sentence, (which may indicate either refinement or coarseness of feeling) that "if a soul is not worth saving, it is not worth damning," is we think, intended as a witty piece of *ad captandum*—a sort of a savory sop thrown out to gratify his unregenerate Ishmaelitic camp-followers. We make no serious objection to this rhetorical sortie, because the actor and the auditors consist beautifully,

JOHN F. ROWE.

## DR. REXFORD'S REPLY.

To the Editor of the Gazette:

DEAR SIR: A correspondence on the subject of religion, it seems to me, should not only aim to advance the truth, but should seek to present it in such a guise as to make its acceptance desirable. I had hoped that the correspondence recently commenced in the *Gazette* would be characterized by a courteous and dignified presentation of opinions, and by its candor be saved from those humiliations that are in place, if ever, only in a political campaign. Religious discussion with me is not a bristling strife. I believe profoundly in the truth of certain positions I have assumed regarding religion, and I would have no objection to a consideration of the merits involved in them, in a series of letters, that would not in themselves destroy the very grace and desirableness of truth.

I decline, however, any further correspondence until it can be conducted with the candor and christian courtesy befitting an earnest effort to arrive at the best results of truth and life.

I herewith give in brief the grounds of this decision: In the last communication of my critic I find such expressions as the following: "His scientific flourishes"—"Now after that deduction let his admirers depart in peace for they have seen the salvation of all flesh"—"That's an answer with a vengeance, isn't it?"—"You magisterially point to the dreamy Church Fathers"—"Rhetorical kite-flying"—"Your reserved ministerial dignity"—"His serene dignity"—"A sort of savory sop thrown out to gratify his unregenerate Ishmaelitic camp-followers." This last was used with reference to my saying that "if a soul is not worth saving it is not worth damning."

My "ministerial dignity" is referred to in the above, and I have only this to add, that not only my ministerial dignity, but my respect for the truth, and the grace of Christian character, will not allow me to be a party to the unseemly business of continuing before an Akron public an order of verbal representation which so effectually repudiates the common courtesies of civil life as the above representations do. I have neither the time nor the inclination to engage in any such business. I hold myself in readiness to consider some of these religious questions in a series of letters, if they can be exchanged with any Christian gentleman for whose character a sufficient guaranty can be given, and who while defending what he thinks the truth, will not make it offensive by his methods. I am yours truly,

E. L. REXFORD.

AKRON, O., May 26th, 1879.

## THE BASIS OF CHRISTIANITY.

To the Editor of the Gazette:

DEAR SIR: I have carefully read Dr. Rexford's second rejoinder to my second article. In order not to mislead and confuse your readers with complicated headlines, and in order also to clearly define my propositions, I have chosen the above heading to this article. I shall avoid as far as possible all scholastic jargon, and all speculative and unscriptural terminologies. My respondent has chosen as the caption of his second article, to which this is a reply, "*God's Mercy Not Seen in the Vicarious Sacrifice of Christ*"—a very complex and misleading proposition. My former article, to which he replies, was headed: "*Does the Blood of Christ Cleanse from Sin?*" This is the proposition we are to discuss, and not something extraneous to this. As we are examining a Scriptural proposition, and not one that is speculative and metaphysical, we trust that Dr. Rexford will confine his arguments to the Bible as the only source of information, as touching the questions involved in this controversy. Before proceeding any further, I wish to inform my worthy friend that I do not propose, in this discussion, to represent the sentiments of what is termed the "orthodox" world, and that he must not hold me responsible for the vagaries of Archbishop Anselm, John Calvin, and all that sort. I feel bound, however, to notice whatever he may adduce from the Word of God.

I presume not to fathom the mind of the Omnipotent, nor to penetrate his deep counsels as they relate to the "vicarious sacrifice of Christ." We have to do with *revealed* facts, and not with the *mysteries* of the Kingdom of God. The death of Christ forms the basis of Christianity, or it does not. I can give no philosophical reason why God, in harmony with the principles of his moral government, demanded the death of Jesus Christ, and why he decreed that eternal life, in some way, inscrutable to finite minds, must be obtained through that death. As my respondent is fond of analogies, I would remark that physically we live upon death—upon disorganized matter—and that physical life is perpetuated through the medium of death. Can my erudite friend explain the philosophy of this process? Let him try it. My proposition is, that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins," and that as the perpetuation of physical life depends solely upon compliance with conditions, so also the securing of spiritual, eternal life depends on compliance with conditions.

I submitted twelve questions to the dear Doctor, with the request that he answer them categorically, and specifically, but instead of regarding my request—which I had a right to expect, and which the people had a right to anticipate—like "an owl on stealthy wing" he swoops away into a dense jungle of hypotheses, airy flights, and boshy *non sequiturs*. Alas, that logic should be so mangled and mutilated in the house of its friends! Can anybody tell what he means by subtending from the angle of his mental vision such a proposition as this:

"The original demand of justice was, that on account of the sin of Adam the whole human family should suffer forever, if we except perhaps the small number of the "elect" provided for by the caprice of Calvinism. Here was the doom of the race. It was averted by Christ appearing as a substitute.

And when it is asked how Christ, being one person, could suffer all that the whole race would suffer forever, it is answered that he being infinite, could suffer as much, and did suffer, in his death, as much as the whole human family could suffer for an eternity. If the term of suffering was lessened, its intensity was increased, and hence the product was undiminished. So much agony was due the divine law, and it was provided and endured by Christ."

This may be an answer to Archbishop Anselm and John Calvin, *et id genus omne*, but I beg leave to remind Dr. Rexford that he is not debating with the distinguished dead, but with my humble self. I make no defence of their scholastic theories. I do not talk about the blood of Christ as I would about money and merchandise—so much money for so much merchandise. I am no more responsible for the *crudities* of Calvin than I am responsible for the unsupported assertions of my respondent. The cardinal doctrine of Universalism, that the sinner must "pay as he goes along"—that without the intervention of God's mercy he must *work out* his own salvation—is a doctrine more mercenary, and pitched on a lower plane, than anything the rigid and frigid John Calvin ever wrote. It is enough for me to know, as expressed in the language of Paul, that "we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for (by) the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he *by the Grace of God* should taste death for every man." [Heb. 2:9.] Dr. Rexford has no room for "grace" in his theory. He has no room in his theology for the 53d chapter of Isaiah, in which Christ is represented as having "*borne our griefs,*" "*carried our sorrows;*" as *stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted;*" as having been "*wounded for our transgressions,*" "*bruised for our iniquities;*" that "*the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed.*" This is what our friend ironically calls "substitution." I am unable to tell *how* the sufferings of Christ, or the duration of his sufferings, or the character of his sufferings, bring "life and immortality to light." God does not allow me to set aside palpable facts by my crude speculations.

Evidently Dr. Rexford does not believe in the "pardoning power." He thinks it would be unjust in a Governor to pardon a criminal before the term of his sentence has expired. He denies that either the Governor or the people have a right to release a condemned man from the penalty of retributive law. On this principle he would never forgive his own guilty child; he would never forgive rebels against the civil government who have laid down their arms; no, he would never proclaim an amnesty. All this would be so unjust! Wonder if the Doctor believes in the death penalty for the crime of murder. Oh, no, the Doctor will not allow God to forgive sins through Jesus Christ. After a criminal has paid the full penalty of violated law, and stands outside of his prison-house a free man, he snaps his fingers disdainfully and triumphantly says—"No thanks to judge or jury, or to the people, or to the clemency of the Governor, for I have fully satisfied the law." Let us suppose one of Mr. Rexford's sinners to be standing before the great white throne. While other redeemed sinners are shouting in the presence of the coronated King, "Unto *him* that loved us, and washed us from our sins *in his own blood*, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to *him* be glory and dominion for ever and ever," the Doctor's sinner—supposed to be there—shouts aloud: "No thanks to God, no

thanks to the Son of God, no thanks to the blood of Christ, no thanks to the Bible or to the preacher.—*I am my own savior, I saved myself, I worked my way to glory, I paid the uttermost farthing!*" In such a system as that, where is there a possible motive for moral or religious action? There is none whatever, and I challenge my friend to show it. He does not believe in the "literal value" of the blood of Christ, but he believes "in its symbolism." Very well; will you be so good as to tell us *what* it symbolizes? There must be a *basis* for every symbol. Give us the basis. He justly says, "we could find the traces of the literal blood of atonement on the altars of the old Aztec deities and among the darkened souls of all time, where an angry god was (is?) worshipped." Very true, Sir; but where, pray, did these "darkened souls" get the idea of sacrifice and atonement? Did they derive the idea from human wisdom, or from human philosophy, or from nature? As there is nothing in nature or in reason to suggest the idea of sacrifice and propitiation, it must have had its origin in a supernatural revelation. No matter how degraded a nation may be, even if it has sunken to the low depths of Fetichism, the felt necessity of expiation and propitiation prevails there. This tradition can only be traced back to the first organization of society, where the Almighty commanded the erection of the first altar of sacrifice, and when he ordained that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins." This fact of itself upsets the whole theory of Universalism. And here we propound the question to Dr. Rexford—Can an institution be perpetuated any length of time that never had an origin? How could you perpetuate the Fourth of July if the people of the "Thirteen Colonies" had not declared their independence on that eventful and memorable day?

My friend should not beg the question by crying out "intolerance and a want of frank and generous liberty to think," so long as we both have the privilege of free discussion through the medium of an untrammelled press. If he feels hurt because we doubt the solidity of the foundation upon which he stands, he must not hence infer that we impugn his motives or doubt the sincerity of his heart. As an honorable disputant I dare not do that. Let him understand, then, that I am not discussing his *character*, but his *system* of religion. He says he "does not read in the Bible that Jesus Christ came into this world to save us from God." Nor do I. But you deny that Jesus Christ came into this world to save us *from our sins*. You utterly deny a doctrine that pervades every page of the New Testament. While you discard the doctrine of Christ's mediatorship between God and man, you at the same time say that you "believe that Jesus is the Mediator between man and all that is *above man*." To me this is nebular. Who or what do you refer to by the expression "*above man*?" It must be something, inexplicable to me, that reposes midway between God and man.

My friend affects to be very much shocked at the idea that God will inflict eternal punishment upon the wilfully disobedient. The question we are discussing is not one that is founded on natural affection, but one that affects the stability of God's moral government, and one which involves the principles of justice and rectitude. As the Doctor is delighted with illustrations, we will suppose a case. Suppose

the son of some father a hundred or five hundred miles from home, commits a cold-blooded murder. Does our dear Doctor lose any sleep on account of that distant murder? Does his appetite fail him? Does he deny himself of the enjoyments of society? Does he banish music and merriment from his home? To ask these questions is to answer them. The father of the criminal son is bowed down in grief, no one can tell the agony of his heart, sleep has departed from his couch, and he has no desires for the pleasures of society. Suppose Dr. Rexford and this man change places. Would there not be a change in the *feelings* of both parties? The Doctor might now mourn, but the other man would have no cause for mourning. Why not? Simply because the suffering endured in either case is a suffering that proceeds from the natural affections; so that when a man dies, and his natural affections are cut off, there comes an end to this kind of suffering. While a godly mother is *drawn toward* her criminal son through the medium of her affectional nature, her spiritual nature at the same time *revolts* at the enormity of his crime, and *draws away* from contact with such a depraved soul. As neither flesh nor blood can inherit the Kingdom of God, all suffering ceases when the ransomed spirit passes the crystal gates of glory. Thus we have disposed of another sophism.

In my first article I said that I would like to know on what principle of God's moral government Dr. Rexford will save a sinner from eternal punishment who dies in an impenitent *state*. If a man is in a *state* of sin, under sentence of eternal death—which is the Scriptural argument throughout—and dies despising the Gospel and cursing God, by what means, beyond the present period of reconciliation, as well as beyond the grave, will this incorrigible sinner be eternally saved? You say eternal punishment is unreasonable and unworthy of God. How can a finite mind know? The question is this: Must not the measure of God's *punishment* be the measure of God's *justice*? And who will presume to measure the justice of the infinite God? What was the measure of Christ's atonement? Was it a finite or an infinite atonement? If finite, then the punishment of sin may be limited; if infinite, then who dare say that punishment may not be eternal? If man dies in a *state* of sin, and no provision is made in the Gospel for man *in a state of sin beyond the grave*, Dr. Rexford will enlighten many eyes by letting us know how this is to be consummated.

I have an idea the Doctor was off his guard when he made the following statement: "There is a divine law of 'imprisonment for debt,' and men are not free till they are *right* (made right?) before all the divine laws. These laws ought to be kept and not cancelled, and while I believe in the blood of Christ, in its symbolism, I am shocked that any man in these days should insist upon its literal value in the economy of divine Providence." But the question still returns: If a man dies in a state of sin, and goes out of this world with murder in his heart and blood upon his hands, it devolves upon our respondent to show, by an appeal to the inspired Word of God, when in the far future, that man will be "*made right before all the divine laws*." It is wholly an assumption that such a character will be made finally holy and happy. It is a hazardous adventure, even in the administration of civil law, to settle questions of justice and equity by interposing the promptings of the natural affections.

Dr. Rexford's illustration of the "sick child" and the "strong brother" is entirely gratuitous. I have not assumed that position: that is the creation of his own imagination. I shall have to call in the aid of some illustrious metaphysician or sophist to aid me in untwisting the following proposition, subtended from a certain angle of his mental vision: "It is for the benefit of the people that government exists, and punishment is one of the aids to that general result. And when it is asked what punishment is just, it must be answered, that which results in *obedience*, inasmuch as obedience to just laws is the highest good." This is another fallacy. It is here *assumed* that "punishment results in obedience." It may in some cases, but is it a universal law? Our criminal code contradicts this bold assumption. Incurable violators of the law are sorry when apprehended by our civil officers. Are they sorry because they have done wrongs, or sorry simply because they have been captured? Sorry because they have been captured, for just as soon they escape the clutches of the law, they are found at their old tricks again. I freely admit that "obedience to just laws is the highest good." But if the sinner persists in *disobedience* till the day of his death, what disposition will you make of him?

When Dr. Rexford irreverently declares that "*God's mercy is not seen in cancelling just penalties*," he at once excites in my mind the suspicion that he does not believe in Jesus Christ as the Son of God; and I hence infer that he is only a moralist, a deist, and not a Christian. Any man who denies that Jesus the Christ is "the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world," and that God cannot "cancel just penalties" through that name, takes away at one stroke the foundation of Christianity. Take away the sacrifice and the atoning blood of Christ, and, so far as worldly matters are concerned, the morals of Seneca, the pandects of Justinian, the pantheism of Budha, the fatalism of Brahma, and the diatribes of Mormonism, will answer all practical purposes. Luke (xxiv. 46,47) records this fact: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day. and that repentance and *remission of sins* should be preached *in his name* among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Peter and Paul, and all the Apostles, preached absolute obedience to God, in the name of Jesus Christ, "for the remission of sins," and yet here is a man who confronts God Almighty by blasphemously asserting that "*God's mercy is not seen in cancelling just penalties!*" The words of the Apostle John are in place: "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesses not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God; *and this is that spirit of antichrist* whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world."

Our dear Doctor is not even a good Universalist; he is simply a rationalist—a man of good morality, a gentleman of good standing in society, a fine orator, and possibly a good scholar. He has no doubt some religious feelings. But where the *Christian* comes in, we fail to see.

JOHN F. ROWE.

## DR. REXFORD RETIRES ON HIS DIGNITY.

*To the Editor of the Gazette:*

DEAR SIR: I have read with much surprise, and no doubt your readers have read with equal surprise, Mr. Rexford's refusal to continue our discussion of the theological differences existing between us. He gives certain reasons for abruptly closing the discussion. Whether the reasons he assigns will satisfy the public yet remains to be seen. I regard his reasons as utterly puerile. I defy him to show where I have in the least impugned his motives or called in question the honesty of his heart. He asserts that I have violated "the common courtesies of civil life" by certain "expressions" and "methods" of debate. My style is my own; but what has style or method of expression to do with argument?

Let us glance at some of *his* "courtesies." In the first place he declined replying to my first article because it appeared over an anonymous signature, and yet in the very same issue of the *Gazette* where his declination appears he replies to an anonymous article signed "G!" He next alludes to me as his "*would be critic*," which expression was meant as a contemptuous sneer, and as intended to disparage my ability to measure lances with him. Then he speaks of my "*attempted arguments*," by which expression he meant to convey the idea that my arguments were unworthy respectful notice. And yet I did not complain. And in his last communication of May 26 he uses the following language: "I hold myself in readiness to consider some of these religious questions in a series of letters, if they can be exchanged with any Christian gentleman for whose character a sufficient guaranty can be given." What does he mean by this insinuation? Does he mean to asperse my Christian character? Is not that the implication? Does he not decline discussing with me on the ground that I am not a "Christian gentleman?" And this is *his* exhibition of what he is pleased to style "the common courtesies of civil life!"

He now proposes to discuss my Christian "character," and let the argument go. Let me assure the reverend gentleman that such a maneuver as that does not fill the bill. I make no defense of my Christian character. This community, among whom I have associated for thirteen years, may decide upon my character, while you and I, sir, will take care of this theological discussion. No, sir, the fact is, you have very uncavalierly backed down from a discussion of the issues between us, and you dare not meet them. No, sir, the verdict of this community is, that you are routed, "foot, horse and dragoon." It is well known that you have not given a direct answer to one of the many questions I have submitted to you in all fairness and candor. But

"He who fights and runs away,  
May live to fight another day."

The following questions remain unanswered, and until they are answered Dr. Rexford must pass in this community as only a rationalist, and not as a Christian

1. Do you believe the Bible, or any portion of it, to be inspired?
2. Do you believe the Bible, or any portion of it, to be supernaturally revealed?

3. Do you believe that Jesus Christ is "the Son of the living God"—the Logos that was "in the beginning"—"Immanuel" (God with us); that "by Him were all things created;" that "without Him was not anything made that was made;" and that "He is before all things, and that by Him all things consist?"

4. Is Jesus Christ the author of eternal salvation?

5. Is salvation conditional or unconditional?

6. If "all the promises of God in Him are yea, and in Him Amen," can a man be saved who is not in Him?

7. If a man "dies in his sins," how may we infallibly know that, in the far future, he will be delivered from his sins?

8. If "the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one who believes it," can a man, under the Gospel dispensation, be saved who wilfully rejects the Gospel?

9. Are mankind in a state of sin, and if so, does Christ redeem from a state of sin?

10. Does God pardon sinners, and if so, on what condition?

11. Do you believe mankind could have been saved without the advent and willing sacrifice of Christ?

12. Can you show, either by reason or revelation, how the penalty of sin could be removed without the death, resurrection and glorification of Christ?

In conclusion I wish to say that while I regard Dr. Rexford's system of religion is wholly untenable, I take pleasure in saying, at the same time, that I have among the Universalist people some good and precious friends, for whom I have a high personal regard, whom I esteem very highly on account of their many virtues, and who are high-minded and honorable in spite of the dangerous and defenceless system.

I presume to say that if my Christian character shall be sufficiently endorsed, and I promise to employ only pure speech and elegant style, that the said "Rev. E. L. Rexford, D. D.," will resume the discussion according to promise. The Doctor shall have "candor and Christian courtesy," and plenty of argument to boot.

JOHN F. ROWE.

### FORMAL CHALLENGE.

Now, Sir, since you decline discussing with a man of doubtful Christian character, we jointly challenge you to an oral discussion of the theological differences existing between us, to be held in this place, the time of debate to be fixed to suit your own convenience. We promise you a knight worthy of your steel, a man of character, and, like yourself, the president of a college. Will you take up the glove? Or if you feel your own incompetency to defend your system, you shall have the privilege, Sir, to select a champion from among your own ranks. Here now is an opportunity to distinguish yourself. Mind, it is your system, not the character of John F. Rowe, that is to be discussed.

JOHN F. ROWE,  
C. C. SMITH.

AKRON, Ohio, June 4, 1879.

### A CARD.

To the Editor of the Gazette:

DEAR SIR: Our attention has been called to a communication in your last issue from Dr. E. L. Rexford, in which certain insinuations are thrown out concerning the character and Christian standing of Elder John F. Rowe, which, among those not acquainted with him, are calculated to beget a prejudice against him.

We wish therefore, through the columns of your paper, to say that we believe Mr. Rowe to be an earnest Christian gentleman, whose character is above reproach, Very respectfully,

C. C. SMITH, Pastor Church of Christ.

LEVI ALLEN,

JACOB RHODES,

WM. SISLER,

Elders of the Church of Christ, Akron, Ohio.

F. M. GREEN,

Cor. Sec'y General Christian Missionary Convention.

AKRON, O., June 3, 1879.

### BELLIGERENT THEOLOGY.

To the Editor of the Gazette:

DEAR SIR: I find in the last issue of your paper a "Formal Challenge" to debate orally the questions of theological difference, etc. This challenge is signed by John F. Rowe and C. C. Smith. In the challenge I am asked if I will "take up the glove," and I am promised an opportunity to "distinguish myself."

Permit me to say in reply that I am in no fighting mood, as this "taking up the glove" would indicate. I am not anxious for any belligerent exercise. My proposition to exchange letters on these religious questions, with any Christian gentleman whose methods do not offend the common sense of propriety, remains unchanged. It is in your paper of two weeks ago. I still abide by it.

SELF DISTINCTION.

These challengers are more generous than I could desire, in their proffer of opportunities for me to distinguish myself. I must decline their generosity in this respect. My ambition in any religious endeavor will be abundantly satisfied if I can advance the truth and I should prefer to engage in that work with parties with whom the thought of self distinction is evidently not so manifest. A rational faith, sincerely held, will answer my chief desire in this regard, and if the thought of self distinction is the leading thought in a religious discussion, as these

challengers manifestly regard it, I commend them to other parties who are willing so to put self advancement before the simple truth.

In addition I may say that if I were seeking self distinction I believe I should look in several more promising directions.

REFLECTIONS ON CHARACTER.

Permit me a word as to the accusation of this kind contained in the last *Gazette*. I cast no reflection. I stated all I meant. I quoted the passages from Mr. Rowe's article which prevented me, out of respect for others as well as for myself, from any further correspondence. I had advanced a sentiment which I certainly hold as legitimate, that "if a soul is not worth saving it is not worth damning." This was said of the eternal anguish of a soul. I believe, with undivided persuasion, that if God should find in His universe a soul that had no good qualities or possibilities in it, instead of his tormenting it forever, would allow it to drop out of existence rather than hold it in conscious being for the mere purpose of being miserable. Hence my sentence "if a soul is not worth saving it is not worth damning." Of this sentiment your correspondent said: "It is a savory sop, thrown out to gratify his (my) unregenerate and Ishmaelitic camp-followers."

This display of character warranted me fully in declining all further discussion. It was a gross reflection, a deliberate accusation of general demoralization, passed upon every Universalist in the community, and all other people who attend the services of the Universalist Church.

This is the ground of my refusal to continue the discussion. I will not discuss the question of religious truth with a man for whom religious truth has manifestly done so little.

In the estimation of C. C. Smith, Levi Allen, Jacob Rhodes, Wm. Sisler and F. M. Green, John F. Rowe may be the very perfection of these ideal Christian gentlemen, but the foregoing facts do not reveal my kind of a Christian gentleman. It is a difference of taste no doubt, but it is said sometimes that "there is no accounting for taste."

I believe that religion is entitled to some regard on the score of a common civility, recognized even by the "unregenerate" world, and the man who can not tolerate a differing opinion without charging its advocates with being "unregenerate and Ishmaelitic camp-followers" is the man with whom I will not discuss the question of theology, though all the clergymen and deacons of the Disciple Church in the country, of like mindedness, should indorse his Christian character.

I am yours truly,

E. L. REXFORD.

Akron, Ohio, June 10, 1879.

P. S.—As to an oral debate I may say, my impression is that the prospects for such an entertainment is not encouraging for the reason that it will be difficult to find any self-respecting Universalist who will except a challenge that comes with such manifest ill grace as does the challenge contained in last Sunday's *Gazette*. We are not "picking up gloves" or seeking self-distinction. We are laboring for the truth, and when any parties will invite discussion for the sake of advancing the truth and not for the mere excitement of controversy, enough men can be found, I trust, among Universalists who in becoming humility will engage in a religious inquiry to learn what the Divine truth is.

E. L. R.

THE FATE OF THE WICKED.

To the Editor of the Gazette:

DEAR SIR: Dr. Rexford having declined to continue the discussion of the tenents of Universalism, and having been urged by many of the citizens of this community to prosecute the investigation of the doctrinal basis of Christianity, I will, with your permission, comply with the wishes of the interested parties, and proceed *ad libitum*.

The great question, as at first introduced into the columns of your paper, and which I intend to keep prominent before your readers, is not a question of speculation or of human philosophy; nor is it a question of opinion or sentiment, but a sober question of fact; a fact that must be sustained by homogeneous testimony, such only as the Holy Scriptures afford. One man's opinion, or one man's theory, is of as much importance as any other man's. Theories, and opinions, and sentiment prove nothing. The proposition and the proof must always be homogeneous; that is, of the same character. We prove a mathematical problem by mathematical evidence, and not by historical evidence. We do not prove a historical proposition by historical evidences of botany and geology. A supernatural proposition is sustained, not by natural, but by divine testimonies. Having premised these general statements, I will now proceed to show, by an appeal to the Bible, that the fundamental doctrine of Universalism is a grand delusion.

Concerning the fate of the wicked, the Old Testament says, they are to be "turned into hell;" "their name" is to be "put out for ever and ever;" "the portion of their cup" is "snares, fire and brimstone, and a horrible tempest;" "they shall perish; consume into smoke; consume away;" they "shall die in their iniquity;" they "shall rise to shame and everlasting contempt;" their "joy is but for a moment;" their "candle shall be put out," and their "hopes perish;" their "hope is as the giving up of the ghost;" their "triumphing is short;" their "end shall be cut off;" a day which "burns like an oven shall burn them up, and leave them neither root nor branch;" they "shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy;" God "will laugh at their calamity, and mock when their fear cometh;" "he will tear them in pieces, and and there shall be none to deliver;" "their expectation shall perish;" their "hope shall be cut off, and their trust be a spider's web."

In the New Testament we read of those who shall be "severed from among the just;" who shall be "cast out into outer darkness;" who shall "depart into everlasting fire;" who shall "lose their souls;" who shall be "destroyed, soul and body, in hell;" who "shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on them;" the Judge at "the end of the world" shall "send forth his angels, and gather them out (not into) of his kingdom, and cast them into a furnace of fire;" they are "reserved to the day of judgment to be punished;" "who shall be punished with an everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power;" "the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever;" "they are bound hand and foot, and cast into outer darkness;" they "receive their good things," "their portion" in this life, and they are "tormented" in the life to come; an im-

passable "gulf" is placed between them and the blessed; they "die in their sins; where Christ is gone, they cannot come;" they "never have forgiveness;" they shall come out of their graves "unto the resurrection of damnation;" "the mist of darkness is reserved to them for ever;" "the heavens and the earth which are now, are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men;" "there is a sin unto death," for which we are not to pray, and which "shall not be forgiven, neither in this world nor in the world to come;" their names shall be "blotted out of the Book of Life;" they are "clouds carried with a tempest," "to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever;" "the devil that deceived them shall be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever;" "and these shall go away into everlasting punishment." We have quoted from the following passages of Scripture: Psa. 9:17; 9:15; 11:6; 37:20; Ezek. 3:18, 19; 33:8, 9; Dan. 12:2; Job 20:5; Prov. 24:20; Job 8:13, 11:20, 20:5; Psa. 37:38; Mal. 4:1; Prov. 29:1, 1:26; Psa. 50:22; Prov. 10:28, 11:7; Job 8:14; Matt. 13:49, 8:12, 25:30, 41; Mark 8:36; Matt. 10:28; John 3:36; Matt. 13:41, 42; 2 Pet. 2:9; 2 Thess. 1:9; Rev. 14:11; Matt. 22:13; Luke 16:25, 26; John 8:21; Mark 3:29; John 5:29; 2 Pet. 2:17, 3:7; 1 John 5:16; Matt. 12:32; Rev. 3:5; 2 Pet. 2:17; Jude 13; Rev. 20:10; Matt. 25:46.

On the duration of punishment, I commented sufficiently in my previous articles. The fulcrum upon which the entire system of Universalism rests is the denial of endless punishment. As I have fully met this denial and exploded it by an appeal to the original Greek, as well as by reference to the various texts of Scripture, I will next advance some corroborating testimony from the very best—the most reliable—Greek (and English) scholars. The question is often put, especially by superficial readers and thinkers—"Will God punish a human being forever, for what is done in a lifetime?" Let us hear the author of *Ecce Deus* on this question:

"For example: a man commits a petty larceny; would the objector say that a month's imprisonment would be enough? Another man, say, commits a murder; would the objector say that a year's punishment would suffice? But why should one criminal be punished a month and the other a year? It is urged that the nature of the crime determines that. Let this be granted; then it will appear that the proportion is not one really of time, but of turpitude. In reality, society proceeds upon this principle: that the extent of time occupied in the perpetration of a criminal act is not to be taken into account in considering the punishment which is to be awarded. Nor ought it to be accounted of. Less time may be occupied in taking away a life than in committing a burglary; but on the principle of a strict proportion (which sophistically proceeds on the idea of mere duration), the burglar should undergo a longer punishment than the murderer. But society will not allow this; its moral instincts overrule its sentimentalities, and demand that the gravity of the crime should determine the gravity of the punishment. (pp. 210-20.)

"Time has no mitigating influence upon guilt. The question between the criminal and society is not one of time, but of penitence, and so long as he is impenitent society must, by a compulsion deeper than all formal law, mark and avoid him. \* \* \* Society punishes (more or less lightly, more or less directly,) all impenitent offenders against its laws, and punishes them throughout their whole lifetime, which is as much of eternity as its retributive influence can encompass. In very grave cases, indeed, society will not allow the penal shadow to pass from the reputation even after death. So truly is this the case, that there are names which cannot now be pronounced, though they represent

long extinct lives, without bringing a frown upon the countenances of all who hear them! Is this eternal punishment, or is it not? (Ibid, p. 212.)

"If vice be its own punishment (not only individually, but socially, in a full degree), why should the thief be imprisoned, or the murderer executed? Why not leave each to the tormenting remorse of his own conscience." (p. 216.)

These are substantially the same arguments I have already presented, only in another form. Let us now hear Moses Stuart—confessedly one of America's finest scholars, and whose knowledge of philology and the ancient languages no one dare call in question—on the meaning of the word "everlasting" as represented in the Greek original. Here is what he says:

"I trust it will not be questioned in regard to the nine cases where *aion* is applied to the happiness of the righteous in another world, and the fifty-one cases where *aionios* is applied to the same, that a happiness without limits, without end, is intended to be designated. Can it reasonably be doubted, then, that the five cases in which *aion* is applied to the future punishment of the wicked, and the seven cases in which *aionios* is applied to the same subject, have a meaning like that of the preceding cases? The time designated in both is future, the world is future. The intention of the writers seems very apparently to have been similar in both cases. The invariable laws of interpretation, therefore, would seem to demand a like exegesis. I take it to be a rule in construing all antithetic forms of expression that, where you can perceive the force of one side of the antithesis, you do of course come to a knowledge of the force of the other side. If *life eternal* is promised on one side, and *death eternal* is threatened on the other and opposite one, is it not to be supposed that the world *eternal* which qualifies *death* is a word of equal force and import with the word *eternal* which qualifies *life*? In no other case could a doubt be raised with regard to such a principle. I venture to say that the exception here (if such a one must be made) is without any parallel in the just principles of interpretation. If, then, the words *aion* and *aionios* are applied sixty times (which is the fact) in the New Testament to designate the continuance of the future happiness of the righteous, and some twelve times to designate the continuance of the future misery of the wicked, by what principles of interpreting language does it become possible for us to avoid the conclusion that *aion* and *aionios* have most the same sense in both cases? It does not plainly and indubitably follow that, if the Scriptures have not asserted the endless punishment of the wicked, neither have they asserted the endless happiness of the righteous, nor the endless glory and existence of the Godhead. The result seems to me to be plain, and philologically and exegetically certain. It is this: either the declarations of the Scriptures do not establish the facts that God and his glory and praise and happiness are *endless*, nor that the happiness of the righteous in a future world is *endless*; or else they establish the fact that the punishment of the wicked is *endless*."

According to Universalism man is a mere passive machine. If not reconciled in this life, God will force men to be reconciled and saved in the life to come. Man will not only be forced into reconciliation and salvation, but he is now forced, according to the doctrine I am reviewing, to do whatever he does, and to be, in spite of his own volition, just what he is. He is forced into sin; forced to live in sin; yea, more than that, forced into hell—such as Universalists believe in—then forced to do *what we call* right, and finally forced into heaven, *volens volens*. And yet we are gravely told that Universalism is a system of mercy!

As to sin and the punishment of sin (to borrow the language of Howard Crosby) they must not be regarded as cause and effect, but as the correlated action of principle; nor can we see that they are one, simply because God's grace prevents it. If we are to rely on Scripture as our infallible guide, we discover that the sting of death is not pun-

ishment, as finite beings call punishment. Sin and the real death is not separation of the soul from the body, but the everlasting "banishment" of the soul "from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power," 2 Thes. 1:9. God's punishment is no extra, superadded infliction, like that administered by parent or schoolmaster, who, when wrong has been done, comes with his rod to chastise the offender. Sin carries its own sting with it to all eternity, as we suggested in a previous article. Wherever sin is found, there you find the sting. If we prove that a man may continue in sin, we prove that he will continue in misery. Is it any more possible for God to separate sin and its sting than it is for him to separate righteousness and its attendant happiness? True, God removes the sting, but it is only removed by the blood of Christ—by taking the medicine of the great Physician of Souls. "Suppose," says Dr. Crosby, "that those who declare that God is too merciful to punish sin, and weave fine theories about the matter, should take their attractive views and apply them to this earth, and assert that there should be no sorrow, or trial, or sickness, will all their philosophy make it true—make it any more than a beautiful picture? And philosophy shall fail as utterly in the future world." "But," some make bold to say, "if sin and punishment are indissolubly connected, why does not God destroy the wicked?" There, again, you are dictating to the Almighty, and "rush in where angels fear to tread." He who presumes to answer that question, in regard to which the Bible is as silent as the grave, penetrates the secret counsels of heaven, and places himself upon an equality with the great Jehovah. Annihilation would be no punishment at all to the wicked. It is only the redeemed child of God who longs for the life to come. Annihilation, or an endless, dreamless sleep, would be a priceless boon to the ungodly. Besides, what do we know about the nature of these souls which God has made? We do know that he made them moral beings, free agents, and as such responsible to the great Creator. Consequently he made it possible for man, in the enjoyment of personal liberty, to sin. And when he made the souls of men, he also made the possibility of eternal misery, for by its very origin the soul may be eternal and cannot die. Could God create an immortal spirit, one capable of choosing life or death, and then extinguish it? As in all these questions, vain, cold philosophy affords us not a gleam of light, and as our speculations leave us in dreary desolation, we must depend solely upon the guidance of God's revealed truth.

JOHN F. ROWE.

## WHAT IS UNIVERSALISM?

To the Editor of the Gazette:

DEAR SIR: The religious discussion begun in your columns recently has terminated in the refusal of one of the disputants to continue to discuss, *not the question at issue, but with the other disputant.* He states his reasons. That the other, in reply, should assume that the reasons stated are not the true reasons, and vaunt himself as victor, is

not surprising, when we consider what a spirit there must be in the man who can employ such language as that quoted back to him, but, having given a formal challenge, and with the matter still pending, that he should enter a deserted field, and send out a new argumentative letter, even at the request of friends, is but another expression of that ungentlemanly spirit which has caused one of the disputants to retire.

I have no desire to be a controversionalist, nor any ambition to see my name in print; but since the last article has so thoroughly "exploded" Universalism, I would like to suggest, not to John F. Rowe, but to the public, that this matter has another side. Any one who will read the context of the passages quoted last week, can see for themselves how many of them refer to the destructions of nations, and how many are entirely irrelevant. That any man should quote the voice of personified wisdom, in the passage: "I will laugh at your calamities," &c., and call it the voice of God, is indeed a surprise. And the plea that God is here *represented* by wisdom conversing with fools, will not be acceptable, as this wisdom is repeatedly designated as *she*; and we have yet to learn that God is anywhere presented as a female.

Take again the famous passage in Matt. 25:46. Read carefully the context, beginning with chapter 24, and you will find that Christ is speaking of things to transpire *in that generation.* True his disciples call it (verse 3) the "end of the world." But the original is not *kosmos* the material world; it is *aion*, which any good Greek lexicon will render "age."

By the way, it is interesting to remark that this word *aion* is the one which a certain article lately labored to signify "endless." Christ's disciples here talk of the *end* of the *aion*.

In verse 6 he says: "Ye shall hear of wars," &c. It must have been coming soon. Again in verses 15, 29, 33, 34, in chap. 24; verses 13, 31, 32, in chap. 25, and on to the end, the same thought continues, of some great catastrophe soon to come. It has no reference to a final judgment, but plainly indicates some national ruin to come in that generation. It doubtless refers to the overthrow of Jerusalem.

Almost anything can be "proven" by quoting and combining many detached passages. Endless punishment is not mentioned or taught in the Bible. What a word signifies in one place *if* it has a certain meaning elsewhere, is not the question. The force of *aion* (an instance of the limited meanings of which we have just quoted) or *aionios*, the adjective based on it, should not be sought from old-school theologians only, but both sides should be seen. Any standard Greek lexicon will give the proper and ordinary use of the word as signifying limited duration. All who wish an exhaustive scholarly treatment of the word can find it in a little work by J. W. Hanson, Chicago. It does not mean, endless.

The "fulcrum on which the entire system of Universalism rests," is *not* a "denial." It has better ground. It affirms in its Articles of Faith:

1st. We believe that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments contain a revelation of the character of God, and of the duty, interest and final destination of mankind.

2d. We believe that there is one God, whose nature is love, revealed in one Lord Jesus Christ, by one Holy Spirit of grace, who will finally restore the whole family of mankind to holiness and happiness.

3d. We believe that holiness and true happiness are inseparably connected, and that believers ought to maintain order, and practice good works, for these things are good and profitable unto men.

The central thought in Universalism is the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Universalists believe in punishment, whenever, and wherever and however much may be necessary to fully accomplish the purposes of God. They do not believe that God punishes aimlessly, but that his chastising hath a purpose. That purpose must be good, since God is good, and must be attained, if God is omnipotent. They do not believe that Christ's mission of saving the world will be a partial failure. So long as a soul is impenitent it cannot be happy; but that death shuts the door to all chance for the soul's improvement, the Scriptures nowhere teach. We do read, Sam. 3:31, "The Lord will not cast off for ever." In St. John, 12:23, Christ says: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." Let no one say that this simply means "to be attractive." The original, *helkuso*, is definite in force, implying the employment of a power sufficient to effect its purpose.

In 1 Tim. 2:4, Paul speaks of God "who will have all men to be saved, and come unto a knowledge of the truth." Again in 1 Cor. 15:19: "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." Read on to verse 28, inclusive, and you find good Universalist doctrine all the way. Christ must reign till he hath put all enemies under him, and at last God shall be all in all. These contexts will bear perusal. The affirmation that Universalism makes man "a mere passive machine" is almost too absurd to deserve notice. Either the author of those words knows very little of what Universalist doctrine is, or—; but this is to the public, not to an individual, and the public can judge. All Christians believe in the power of God's grace; at least Universalists do. What could turn a man to repentance but his convictions and God's grace? Does this "force" a man into reconciliation? If so, all Christians are thus "forced." The only difference is this, that partialists believe God will send forth his spirit and truth will be promulgated with sufficient power to cause conviction and penitence on the part of *some* of God's children; then they come, of their own free will, while Universalists believe that good is stronger than evil, and will triumph at last; and so, that God's grace will continue in power, and truth extend its sway till *all* of God's children will be convinced, and led to come, of their own free will. What is that parable, of the Savior leaving the ninety-and-nine and going out to search for and *find* the last lost one?

That opportunities for change are limited to this life, cannot be proven. If so, there is no hope for the heathen multitudes, and no one can "justify the ways of God to men."

Universalists believe that God can and will do what is best for all his children; and this in no way interferes with the freedom of the will.

Christ gives a picture in St. John, 10:16, which expresses the Universalist's idea: "And there shall be one fold and one shepherd."

C. L.

## FAITH AND REASON.

To the Editor of the Gazette:

DEAR SIR: In your issue of June 8th I find an article from a correspondent who sings himself "Common Sense," and who is disposed to censure me; because I believe certain things in the divine economy which I cannot explain by my reasoning powers. Wonder if this aid-de-camp of my quondom respondent believes only that which he can explain by the process of reasoning. I doubt if he can give an intelligent definition of the word reason. Let me inform this correspondent of *very* "common sense"—both "common and *unclean*"—that he cannot even learn the alphabet, without taking it for granted that *a is a*. I would like to see him undertake to prove, by the powers of reason, that *a is a*. His Catholic and Presbyterian stories may go for what they are worth. If he thinks to catch me with chaff, he is badly fooled for once. Once upon a time an infidel met a little child on its way to Sunday-school. "Where are you going?" said the scoffer to the child of faith. "I'm going to Sunday-school," was the ready response of the child. "What are you going there for, my child?" continued the infidel. "To learn about God and Christ and heaven," was the instant response of the credulous child. "Well," pursued the bland infidel, "don't you believe anything they tell you, unless they *prove* it." "I won't," said the child, as it hastened on to school. When called out to say its lesson, the teacher, pointing to the letter *a*, inquired "what letter is that, my child?" "I don't know," responded the pert child. "Why that is *a*," insisted the teacher. "Well, *prove* it then," was the ready answer of the now incredulous child. "Common Sense" will make tremendous headway in this life, indeed, he will, if he refuses to believe only that which can be demonstrated to the natural senses. Even the Apostle Paul, who was endowed with extraordinary sense, "walked by faith"—not "by sight," which is the way "Common Sense" intends to walk. Not understanding fully the mysteries of redemption, and only "knowing in part," and "looking through a glass obscurely." Paul, as a man of faith, was willing to take God at his word. But here is a man, living eighteen centuries after Paul, who refuses to receive a divine revelation unless the high and mighty God vouchsafes to *him* ocular demonstration! The ancient Greeks refused to believe in the "foolishness" of preaching, because it was not explained to them by "philosophy, falsely so-called." But Paul, the man of faith, told them that "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise.....and weak things to confound the mighty.....and base things.....and things which are despised.....and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are." 1 Cor. ii. 27, 28.

I would like to see a student of nature learn and advance in physical science without first taking some truths for granted. When we find a paradox in science, do we therefore reject it because it is incomprehensible to our natural senses? When I am assured that you can divide any given amount forever and never come to an ending, although this utterly baffles my experience, must I reject it; or, on the contrary, I am told and believe from the proof of my reason that two bodies

can approach each other forever and yet never touch, their intermediate distances being always capable of division, do I doubt the touching that I see daily occurring, because of the clearness of my reasoning against it; and yet, if a statement thus made by science is to be believed, though utterly incomprehensible from its contradiction, must I therefore refuse clear Bible teaching, because I cannot comprehend its mysteries? Instead of teaching me, I presumptuously undertake to teach it. On the one side the Scriptures show me Christ as a man. Then I believe him to be a man in deed and truth. But the Scriptures just as forcibly show me Christ as God, and so I must believe him to be God. But you say, "How can he be both God and man?" That no man can tell. We know the fact, but we cannot comprehend the mode. Here, where philosophy fails us, Faith leads us. The Universalist believes in a personal God. I call on him to prove the fact by the process of reasoning—to demonstrate the fact, or, rather the assertion, to the satisfaction of my natural senses. Can he do it? He cannot. But by the same process that he will undertake to prove that there is a personal God, I will not undertake to prove that there is a personal devil. He does not believe in a personal devil, because the fact is not recognizable by his natural senses—because, forsooth, he cannot prove the fact by *reasoning it out!* He believes there is no hell. Well, by the same process that he will prove (negatively) there is no hell, I will prove that there is no heaven; and by the same mode of reasoning that he will essay to prove there is to be no endless punishment, I will prove that eternal happiness is only a myth—a mere figment of the fancy. If he will say the word hell—*gehenna*—is only *figurative*, I will say with equal propriety that there is no real heaven; that we only have a *figurative* heaven, because the word heaven is derived from the word *heave*, which means to *heave up*, as our material horizon *seems* to be heaved up. No doubt this is what "Common Sense" would call "highly figurative oriental language!" But, see, where your "oriental language" takes you. By following where oriental language takes you, instead of proving *something* to be real, it would disprove everything, and leave us without any reality. Who is prepared for this?

Now, then, if the atonement is of "heathen origin"—if it is only a myth—if there is no healing virtue in the blood of Christ; if Christ is not divine—God incarnate; if there is no hell and no future punishment, if the throne of the great Jehovah is not founded in truth and justice; and if the word of God is not a supernatural revelation—a revelation, which the finite reasoning powers of man cannot explain, then truly is the will of man bound in fate, and, worse than all, there is no possible motive for action. There is left neither motive of love nor the motive of fear. According to the real essence of Universalism, *Pantheism* is true, and Christianity is a lie! Again we ask: Who is prepared for this? According to the system we are investigating, heaven is here and hell is here; God *compels* the sinner to pay the penalty that attaches to every violation of the divine law; no mercy is allowed; God *compels* the sinner to die in his sins; and after landing him on the other side of the river of death, this Universalist God of mercy takes the sinner and *compels* him to become good; that is, changes his moral nature against his own will and disposition—does it by force, and without the consent of the sinner! Where, then, is the

motive for action, either in this life or in the life to come? If civil governments were carried on on this principle, that is, wholly by compulsory measures, and without allowing freedom of action, they would dissolve in twenty-four hours, and leave society in utter chaos. In every form of government there is the motive of fear as well as the motive of love: the motive of love which looks forward for blessing and honor, as a reward for willing obedience to law; and the motive of fear which anticipates punishment and dishonor, as the penalty for wilful disobedience. If this were not so, Christ would never have said in his Sermon on the Mount: "Whoever hears these sayings of mine, and *does them*, I will liken him to a *wise man* who built his house upon a rock; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell not; for it was *founded upon rock*. And every one who hears these sayings of mine, and *does them not*, shall be likened to a *foolish man*, who built his house upon the sand; and the rain descended, and floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon this house; and it fell; and *great* was the *fall* of it."

Excluding the idea of a divine Redeemer, and thereby denying or slurring over the depravity of the human heart; and also denying that "the wrath of God" abides upon the wilfully disobedient and impenitent. Universalists have much to say about Christ as an "Exemplar," as one whose pure and holy life we may imitate with pleasure and profit. Christ is represented as a great Hero, as existing on the same plane with the human family, or possibly rising a degree higher, and our vanity is flattered by the fact of his successful earthly career, and by our possible ability to imitate him. In this sense, Aristotle and Plato and Seneca and Epictetus were divine as Christ was divine, but possibly in a less degree. Is not this highly complimentary to Him, who, as the creator of the law, as the promulgator of the law, and as the avenger of the law, interposes his hand, and his life, to save us from the curse of the law. Had a created being done this, the measure of our gratitude, in the comparison, would be feeble indeed, for the salvation of no creature could have manifested such an intensity of love and such profound condescension. If it was God who stooped to rescue us, voluntarily taking upon himself the "form of a servant," appearing in the "likeness of sinful flesh," and suffering the death of the cross, how is it possible to place bounds to my gratitude. My gratitude becomes a perennial fountain. Can He be only a man, who from eternity is the center and source of eternal life, who to doubting Thomas was Lord God, who in the beginning *was* God, who is King of kings and Lord of lords, who said: "Before Abraham was *I am*," and who allowed the Jesus to regard him a claimant of divine honors—can he, I repeat, be less than God in glory, majesty and power. If Christ was only a creature, what could save us, in our excess of gratitude, from becoming idolaters? To quote the language of a beautiful writer; "Indeed so clear is that idolatry would have ensnared the Church from the exaltation of the Messiah in the work of redemption, that we should have looked for warnings on every page of God's Word against the evil. Instead of that, there is no check to the thankful soul, but rather its gratitude and devotion are fanned by all the earnest exhortations of the New Testament." We read that the Gospel is the Gospel of Christ, the Church is the Church of Christ, the Priesthood is the Priesthood of Christ, the Apostles are the Apostles of Jesus Christ, the

Service is the Service of Christ, that "none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's" (Rom. 14, 7, 8). If Christ is not the Son of God—"God manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached to the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory"—then the service or the Church of Moses is of equal value with the Person and Church of Christ. As no temporal blessing comes to us except through a channel, so all eternal blessings flow to us through Jesus Christ—through his love, his condescension, his death, his resurrection, his ascension, his intercession, his ever-flowing sympathy. In the original Greek he is called *the* Christ, not *a* Christ, because *the* Christ means *the* anointed One. Among the many Christs, the many anointed ones, he was, and is, superlatively *the* Anointed of God. In him dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily. Through Him we approach to the bosom of the heavenly father, and repose upon his promises, even as the beloved John leaned upon the bosom of Jesus. Through him we can see the divine face and hear the divine voice. No earthly priest stands between him and us. Through him we can speak as familiar friends to God, even as the disciples of the Lord spoke to Jesus. God in Christ is brought in contact with the consciousness of every redeemed child of God. We do not soar off into the mystery of his essence, but we delight in the glowing facts of his supernatural manifestations. Paul tells us that the lives of Christians "are hid with Christ in God," and that "when he appears, we shall appear with him in glory." Who dare predicate that of a mere creature? "Every thought of Jesus is a thought of God. Every comfort from Jesus is a comfort from God. Every word from Jesus is a word from God. And as we know Jesus we know God."

JOHN F. ROWE.

"TAKING UP THE GLOVE."

C. C. SMITH REPLIES TO E. L. REXFORD.

To the Editor of the Gazette:

DEAR SIR: In your issue of the 15th, I find a reply from E. L. Rexford to a challenge from John F. Rowe and myself, which demands some notice from me.

He objects to the spirit of the challenge, and gives that as a reason, or excuse, for not accepting it. I wish to say, for my own part, that I fully agree with the Dr. that all religious discussion should be conducted in a kind spirit and in courteous phrase, and that such expressions as are found in the challenge, are objectionable and inexcusable, unless called out by the discourtesies of an opponent; and,

as I had not received any at his hand, I am without excuse, for the course pursued by Dr. Rexford, or any one else, is no criterion for me.

And yet I am surprised, that a man who could say to Mr. Ganter, "You dare not stand up and defend the manifest decision of your church theology," should be so shocked at the idea of "taking up the glove" from John F. Rowe and C. C. Smith. I am surprised that one who possesses such lofty Christian dignity, that he cannot consent to enter into a debate with any idea of personal glory, but solely for the advancement of the truth, (which sentiment is much to be admired), should, at the close of the very article in which the above sentiment is expressed, make such a low fling as the following:

"In addition I may say, that if I were seeking self-distinction, I believe I would look in some more promising directions." I wonder what Bible truth the Dr. was seeking to advance in the above. I think he must have been in the President's chair when he wrote the first, and only a private individual when he penned the second sentiment. I also think it would have been "the brave and honest course" (G. & R. Cor. Pa. 18) for the Dr. to have left out that sentence unless he intended to accept the challenge, for certainly it is not brave to refuse a contest, and then boast over the weakness of an opponent. "Let not him that putteth on his harness boast himself as him that putteth it off;" especially let not him boast that does not intend to put it on.

I was glad to hear him say that religious discussion, with him, was not a "bristling strife," for many of us who had read the Ganter-Rexford correspondence had gotten a wrong impression, and we hardly expected the Dr. to complain of the treatment he should receive at the hands of an opponent.

I wish now to point out one of the Doctor's inconsistencies. He says (G. & R. Cor. Pa. 3), "Heretofore the severity of God's law has been supposed to be on the other side; and people have been unable to see that severity, except in the spectacle of eternal and hopeless misery in a region called Hell, where punishment is inflicted by physical agencies, commonly supposed through fire." Now read from the *Gazette* of May 18th, in his article—Dr. Rexford's Position. "I know of no one who holds now, to the early supposition that hell is a lake of fire and brimstone, or that future torments are inflicted by physical agents." The first of the above paragraphs: "I will not say was designed to carry a false impression." (G. & R. Cor. Pa. 6.)

On page 3, G. & R. Cor. he says: "It seems as though the Christian clergy has been invested with some infernal art spirit, painting the most horrible pictures ever conceived." He could say that, and yet refuse to continue a commenced discussion on the ground that his opponent spoke of his "scientific flourishes," and used the expressions, "That's an answer with a vengeance, isn't it?"—"Rhetorical kite flying"—&c. And above all, called the Universalists "unregenerate Ishmaelish camp followers." Many of us had supposed that J. F. Rowe did not intend the Camp Universalists, but camp followers, (the applauding infidels and spiritualists who hang with such delight on his teaching. Dr. Rexford can imply that the common belief of

Christians is the "hallucination of the Devil, (G. & R. Cor. Pa. 4), and yet those who listen to his teaching, and even though they deny the "Atonement," the "Divinity of Christ," the miracles, and even the inspiration and the authority of the Holy Scriptures, must not be called "unregenerate," or "Ishmaelitish," without exciting the Dr's. Christian indignation to the extent that he will not notice the arguments of the offending one, even though they are strongly fortified with the word of God. Surely "there is no accounting for tastes."

In the *Gazette* of May 18th, article "Christianity, Temperance and Ministers," I find the following: "I believe a man can be a Christian minister, without being a whisky-drinker, a wine-bibber, or a beer-guzzler," and in speaking of what kind of a gospel he (the Dr.) should preach, he says, "It shall be an honest gospel, intent upon doing men good, rather than a morbid compound of scriptural quotations and whisky-cocktails." He might just as well have said that a certain minister or ministers were whisky-drinkers, were wine-bibbers, were beer-guzzlers, did preach a dishonest gospel, did mingle their scriptural quotations with whisky-cocktails. If those sentences do not mean this, they do not mean anything, for who says he (the Dr.) did do any of these things, and it does not soften them any because they were fired from the lava-beds.

When the Dr. wrote the following, he had a certain Christian minister in his mind's eye. It would have been just as honorable for him to have named him. "They may preach what they call a pure gospel on the Sabbath, and their people can obtain it through the fumes of whisky and beer if they choose. They may then walk in our streets the balance of the week the best advertisement of the drinking habits, quoting as the Divine for their general inflamed appearance, the fact—if they can prove it so—that Jesus was a teetotaler." He should not, after the above, make the lack of Christian politeness, on the part of his opponent, a pretext, before the Akron public, for retiring from an unwelcome contest.

Would not the above expressions sound well in a political campaign? Now after this display of the "grace and desirableness of truth," he can not stoop to accept a challenge which intimates he may desire self-distinction. Truly, the Dr's. "fighting mood" must have passed off since the Universalist State Convention, and I think it will take some time for him to make the Akron public believe that there were not weightier reasons lying back of that.

In regard to the Dr's. repeated invitations to consider some of these religious questions in a series of letters, if they can be exchanged with any Christian gentleman, for whose character a sufficient guarantee can be given, and who, while defending what he thinks to be the truth, will not make it offensive by his methods." That appears like an earnest desire, on his part, to continue the investigation. And yet, how difficult to realize. It would be very hard for any of us to furnish the Dr. with a guaranty signed by more than all the deacons and ministers of the whole church, and certainly we would not want *him* to furnish a guaranty (and when he brings one we will treat it with respect) that should he happen to be hard pressed he would not hide behind such flimsy excuses as he has in the past. I suppose by this time he thinks I have violated the rules of Christian courtesy, for

Christian courtesy means, with him, for the Dr. to say unkind things, and handle in the roughest manner the faith we hold most dear, and then treat him and his beliefs in the tenderest manner. I have tried to be polite, and have said the plainest things in his own language, as I know of no one whom he would consider better authority on the subject of politeness than himself. He came into our midst and taught, and as a result, the enemies of the Bible are jubilant, and Christians, for the most part, sad. He has sought to create the impression (in reply to G.) that the Christian ministers call him a blasphemer in the pulpit, because he teaches that all will be holy and happy in heaven. His predecessors, both in the pulpit and in the College, have taught the same, we believe, with equal ability, and not a ripple has been made in our midst. But no other man claiming to be under the banner of Christ, has taught that a vicarious Atonement is a superstition of the past, nor has said: "There is not enough blood in Jesus' veins to cancel the claim of the divine law on such a soul," nor it would be accused blood. "If you enter the Kingdom of God, it will not be by virtue of any one else, but by virtue of what you yourself have done," nor what I heard him say substantially, at the laying of the corner stone of the Universalist Church building in this city, "Sincere religion is the true religion, and he who falls down and worships God through stocks and stones sincerely, worships him as acceptably as he who worships him sincerely through the Lord Jesus Christ." We do not object to his making even these declarations, but do object to his making somebody's methods an excuse for retiring from the contest, when his own is at least objectionable. We made no complaint about his methods, when he informed us "his style was his own." We do object to his caricature of the Christian's faith and to his misrepresentations. We fully recognize Dr. Rexford's right to preach and to write his own opinion in his own manner, however erroneous we may believe them to be, but we protest against his custom of stating the belief of our orthodox Churches in language they uniformly reject. No one deserves the name of Critic, but the one who states the positions of those whom he criticises fairly. No one deserves the name of Critic, who does not understand the position of those whom he criticises.

I was exceeding anxious for a public discussion. I did believe the Dr., if he debated himself, would be driven either from the positions he had taken so boldly in our midst, or would be driven to deny the inspiration of the Bible. I did believe, if he had got any Universalist of note to discuss, he could not be got to affirm his affirmations, and it would appear to the Akron public, that Dr. E. L. Rexford was smiting truths held sacred by many Universalists.

The Dr. has a happy faculty, while retreating, of holding out invitations to come on. He still intimates Universalists can be found to discuss these questions. Well, when he has found them, we will invite him in the sweetest spirit and politest phrase to *investigate*.

Yours truly,

C. C. SMITH.

AKRON, O., June 19th, 1879.

## HO SATANOS, HADES, AND GEHENNA.

To the Editor of the Gazette:

DEAR SIR: In the prosecution of any investigation, it is highly important that the terms of the proposition be clearly defined and all obscurity removed; for without a perspicuous definition of the proposition discussed, it is very manifest that the argument will be involved in confusion; and hence, not only will the writer himself labor amid confusion, but those pursuing his investigation will be equally confused. If the premises are wrong, the conclusions must of necessity be wrong, no matter how elegantly and plausibly, and rhetorically the subject-matter may be presented. The old serpent, Diabolus (*Ho Satanos*, the Adversary) who seduced the beautiful and guileless Eve, was a slippery-tongued fellow, who, having "transformed himself into an angel of light," by plausible words and sophistic appeals, prepared in artistic style, induced the fair Lady to believe—contrary to the word of God—that "in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt *not* surely die." The emissaries of *Ho Satanos* have been using this negative style ever since, and very successfully, for, according to the Roman adage, men willingly believe those things they would have true.

One mode of evading the testimony of Scripture is by adopting *false principles of interpretation*—an art in which every representation of anti-Christ excels. By this expedient, all those passages of Scripture in which the words "everlasting," "for ever and ever," are applied to future punishment, are contemptuously slurred over and set aside. The method of operation is this: because the words have in some instances a limited meaning, they hence erroneously conclude that they have a limited meaning in every case. Granting this principle of interpretation to be correct, the word everlasting may have a limited meaning when applied to God; yea, even the self-existent Jehovah may entirely cease to exist. Indeed, the ecstatic bliss of the righteous, though declared to be everlasting and perennial, may come to an end, and the Kingdom of Christ itself pass away forever. In a similar manner the advocates of Universalism evade the force of those passages in which the word *hell* is used to denote the place of future punishment. They infer that because the *original words* translated hell, do not *always* mean the place of future punishment, that therefore they *never* do. By the same mode of reasoning, we can prove that there is no place of happiness for the righteous in the future world, because the term heaven is frequently used to describe only the regions of our atmosphere. Thus the Scriptures speak of the fowls of heaven, the rain of heaven, and of Mount Sinai burning in the midst of heaven. It is further affirmed by the Universalists that the words in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures translated hell, do in no case denote either the place or the state of future punishment, which is purely an assumption on their part, as we shall presently show. But on the presumption that what they affirm is true, suppose that *Sheol* of the Old and *hades* of the New Testament, mean only the invisible world, or the intermediate state where all departed spirits enter, does it logically follow that all men shall be saved? To ask the question is to answer it. The doc-

trine of future punishment rests on other testimony, which the supposition now made does not in the least affect. I venture to say that if there were not a word said in the Bible describing the place and manner in which the incorrigibly wicked are to be punished, it would not lessen the force of the fact that punishment will be inflicted upon them. God has said in his revealed will that they are to stand before the judgment seat of Christ, to give an account of the deeds done in the body; that they shall receive the reward of their deeds; that they shall go "into everlasting fire," "into everlasting punishment;" and shall be punished with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power. (2 Cor. v. 10; Matt. XXV, 41:46; 2 Thess. 1:9).

The Universalist is wont to assert what is not true, and that which he cannot sustain, when he dogmatically declares that the original words translated hell mean only the invisible world, and that they never indicate a place of future punishment. When Christ made use of the word hell, or *hades*, he spoke in exact accordance with the current sentiment of the Jews, and this he did without one word of explanation. Hence, in view of this fact, I assert that a system of things, which, in order to carry a point, makes Christ play the part of a deceiver, is corrupt to the very core. *Hades* occurs eleven times in the New Testament, and is always rendered *hell*, except in 1 Cor. XV, 55, where it is rendered *grave*. It could with all propriety be rendered hell there, in the sense of the unseen or under world, as well as in other places. It never means *grave* except by metonymy. It is sometimes used in this manner; but literally it means the unseen, the abode of spirits from the time of death to the resurrection of the body, and by metonymy, hell, the place of punishment. In regard to the word *hades*, Dr. George Campbell says: "For the same reason that it does violence to the original to translate the Hebrew, *Sheol*, or the Greek, *hades*, *hell*, so it destroys the sense of many passages to translate it *grave*." Lange, the great German commentator, (in his Introduction to Revelations) says: "*Hades*, (*Sheol*), the realm of the dead, must be kept entirely distinct from the pool of fire, *gehenna*, hell."

From the lexicons we have the following definitions: Pickering, Hades; "The infernal regions; hell; death; place or state of the dead; Pluto; invisible," etc. Robinson—"Pluto's domain; infernal regions; *orcus*; the abode of the dead; the Hebrew *Sheol* signified, in a like manner, the under-world, which was held to be a vast subterranean place," etc. Donnegan—"Invisible; place or state of the dead; Pluto." Greenfield—"Literally, unseen; the invisible abode or mansions of the dead; *orcus*; the place of punishment, hell; the grave; the lowest place or condition."

With these definitions, from the highest lexical authorities, correspond the teachings of the New Testament; as, for instance, Luke XVI, 23: "And in hell—in *hades*—he lifted up his eyes, being in torment.—" Does *hades* in this passage mean only the place of departed spirits? If it means anything, it undoubtedly means a place of torment, into which the rich man (Dives) was conveyed after death, and where he received a just recompense for his evil deeds. And has not *Sheol* the same meaning in Psalm IX, 17, when it is said, "The wicked shall be turned into hell, (*Sheol*) and all the nations that forget

God?" If in this place the word means only the grave, or the place of departed spirits, what, I would like to know, is threatened against the wicked who forget God, more than that which is endured by the righteous who love and obey him? The good and bad alike die and enter the world of spirits; and if this is all that is intended by the woeful denunciation, I can see in it neither propriety nor justice, but only the contrary. What has now been said, does not, by any kind of construction, conflict with the general judgment day, when both the good and bad shall, in a formal and judicial manner, receive according to what they have done in the body. The time is set, not for the judgment of disembodied spirits, but for embodied spirits, a fact which is plainly set forth by Paul, as it relates to the resurrection of the bodies of the righteous, as expressed in the following words: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven; if so be that being clothed we shall *not be found naked*. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." (1 Cor., V. 1:4.) After the general judgment (to which I shall devote an entire chapter in the course of this investigation, D. V.) the saints of God will enter upon their final rest, consentaneous with which event the bodies of the wicked will be consumed in the general conflagration, and their deathless spirits be "banished from the presence of God and from the glory of his power." (See 1 Thess., IV. 13-18; 2 Thess. I. 7-10; 2 Peter, 3d chapter.

The best authorities inform us that *Sheol* of the Old Testament and *Hades* of the New, are terms of the same import, and are commonly used as a general designation of the invisible world, or the place of departed spirits. This place was regarded by all nations of antiquity, especially by the Greeks and Romans, as divided into two parts, into one or the other of which all men entered at death, and were there rewarded or punished according to their just deserts, as they were good or bad in this life. They did not suppose that in the invisible state departed souls were inactive, nor that they were all happy, but that they existed in a state of conscious activity in the separate mansions of *hades*, and were happy or miserable according to their respective characters. In the Septuagint of the Old Testament, *Sheol* is rendered *hades*—a word which, among the ancients, always conveyed the idea of future punishment as well as future blessedness.

Universalists have tried in vain to fritter away the meaning of the word *gehennæ* by undertaking to prove that it means only a valley in the vicinity of Jerusalem. It was a word peculiar to the Jews, and was employed by them some time before the coming of Christ to denote that part of *Sheol* which was the habitation of the wicked after death. This is proved by the fact of its familiar use in the New Testament; and by the fact of its being found in the Apocryphal books and Jewish Targums, some of which were written before the advent of Christ. These Targums, as the intelligent reader well knows, were translations and interpretations of the Hebrew Scriptures. Three of these Targums, (Empie's Remarks on Universalism) in remarking on

various passages of the Old Testament, use the word *gehenna*, and explicitly explain it to mean the place of future punishment for the wicked. It follows from these premises that if Christ did not use this word in a totally different sense from that in which it was used by the persons whom he addressed, he must have employed it to denote, beyond a doubt, the place of future punishment. And that he did thus use it, must be evident to every unprejudiced mind who examines the passages in which the word occurs. Take an example: "Fear not them who kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell—*gehenna*." (Matt. X. 28.) Here is another example: "And I say to you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom you shall fear: Fear him, who, after he has killed, has power to cast into hell; (*gehenna*) yea, I say to you, Fear him." Luke xii, 4-5. Men may destroy the body, (*soma*) but it is only God who has power to cast the soul (*psuche*) into hell. The souls of the wicked are to be destroyed *after* the death of the body. Smith's Bible Dictionary, after giving the history of the word, as referring to the celebrated valley of "Hinnon near Jerusalem, says: It became in latter times the image of the place of *everlasting punishment* where 'the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched,' in which the Talmudists place the mouth of hell," etc. He then adds: "In this sense, (a place of everlasting punishment) the word is used by our blessed Lord in Matt. v. 20:30; x. 28; xxii. 15:33; Mark ix. 43:45; Luke xii, 5," etc., referring to the identical passages under consideration. Kitto, agreeing substantially with Smith, says: "It came to be regarded as a sort of type of hell." Parkhurst says: "*Gehenna* was, in our Saviour's time, used by the Jews for hell, the place of the departed. This appears from the word being thus applied by the Chaldee Targums, by the Jerusalem Targums, and that by Jonathan ben Uzziel." Prideaux, and other authorities, represent some of the Targums as going back as far as the days of Ezra, and certainly to the days of the Maccabees, and that they were highly regarded by the Jews in the time of Christ, and had been for many years before. To infer, then, that because the term thus applied, has an allusion to the valley of Hinnon, there is no real hell, is about as smart as to infer that there is no real heaven, because the word *paradise*, as used by Christ, in his address to the dying thief, has an allusion to the garden of Eden. But enough for this paper.

JOHN F. ROWE.

P. S.—Since writing the above, the *Gazette* of June 22nd has made its bright and shining appearance, containing an article entitled, "*What is Universalism?*" and signed "C. L." Who this "anonymous" writer is I know not, and who this aide-de-camp No. Two is, I care not; but, judging from the *sophomoric* contents of the communication, I must infer that it is the product of some college student—possibly a Professor of Languages. I would suggest to "C. L." that it is an easy thing to howl over a dead lion. When a chieftain falls, or retreats, or hides himself in an ambush of trivial excuses, or plays in the role of a persecuted martyr, it is the most natural thing in the world for his aiders and abettors to get up a *ruse*. I would also suggest to "C. L."

that, as he is about six weeks behind in this discussion, that he go back and begin at the beginning, and follow up my argument *seriatim*, and that in particular he answer my *Twelve Questions*, which to this date remain unanswered. Just now, before this public, this is of far more importance than advertising "a little work by J. M. Hanson." If "C. L." desires to establish a book agency in Akron, he is at liberty to do so, but just now the people are more concerned about a "living dog than a dead lion." But since the remarks of this new adventurer for literary honors are not intended for the man whom he criticises, but for "the public," of course this "C. L." who fires from behind a tree, will not pursue me and review my argument. Oh, no; the principal thing now is to go and buy a "little work by J. M. Hanson."

J. F. R.

## EVASIONS OF PLAIN SCRIPTURES.

*To the Editor of the Gazette:*

DEAR SIR: Having noticed several evasions of Scriptures in my last paper, in which rare art our Universalist friends excel, I now proceed to call special attention to a few more. And the first evasion I shall notice is this, that *not sinners, but only their sins* are to be destroyed in the future world. By this sophistical device, all those passages are ignored and set aside which speak of the wicked as being consumed, cast away and utterly destroyed. According to the teaching of some Universalists, such passages mean only that the coarse vices and wicked dispositions of the ungodly shall be destroyed, while the ungodly themselves in person will enter the kingdom of glory. In harmony with such an assumption they gravely inform us that the goats which are placed on the left hand of the Judge, on the great Judgment Day, and by him doomed to everlasting punishment, are *the crimes* of sinners, and not the individual sinners themselves! How supremely absurd. If this is not offering a premium on sin, I fail to comprehend the meaning of language. It is possible that when our courts of justice and equity shall once acquire the skill of punishing theft and perjury and murder in the abstract, while the guilty parties themselves shall be permitted to go free, it may then perhaps be explained how *the sins* of the wicked, at the final day, shall be sent away into everlasting punishment, while consentaneous with this event the individual sinners themselves shall enter in and seat themselves complacently around the great white throne.

Another palpable evasion is this: that all the punishment sin deserves, or that is threatened in the Bible, is endured in the present life; or, as maintained by the *advance* school of Universalists, there may be some punishment in the future world; but they never concede this, except when driven to that position by the force of argument and Scriptural testimony. On the assumption that all punishment is endured in this life, all those passages which threaten destruction and pronounce woe upon the wicked in the future, are defiantly set aside,

as indicating only the evils which they endure in this world. If I held a doctrine as flimsy and self-stultifying as this, I would be candid enough so to say, that the curse of the law, the wrath of God, the worm that never dies, the fire that is never quenched, the weeping and the wailing and the gnashing of teeth, and "the terrors of the Lord," which are so graphically and fearfully described in the Bible, as the "just recompense" of the wicked, are terms of speech utterly without meaning. Are such calamities predicated only of time and not of eternity? Are the threatenings of the great Jehovah, the solemnities of the great judgment day, and the terrors of hell to be frittered down to mean only the pains and sorrows incident to this life? If therefore the doctrine I am investigating be true, is it not superlatively ridiculous to talk or preach about a system of salvation—a system that utterly excludes the idea of God's mercy and of the grace of Jesus the Christ? If, as I observed in a former paper, a criminal has suffered the full penalty of the law, and has *worked out* all that his crimes deserve, must he be told that his release from prison and punishment is an act of grace? Does he not demand his liberty as an act of justice? Hence, on the same principle, if men receive the punishment that is due them for all the sins they have committed in this life, can they not claim exemption from future punishment as a legal and moral right? And so it comes to pass that instead of all being saved by Christ, none are saved by Him! All are discharged on the ground of sheer justice, and consequently, as remarked before, the whole system of grace, as procured by the death of Christ, and as preached by the apostles of the Lamb, sinks down disgracefully to the merest farce!

Some admit that there is a *future state of probation*, but they at the same time make bold to say that future punishment is *only disciplinary*. By this evasion, all those texts which threaten the wicked with everlasting punishment, are adroitly explained to mean only the chastisement of a fond father, inflicted on disobedient children for their own good. This bold and bad doctrine is a mere assumption, as we shall see. There is not a passage in the entire Bible which even intimates that the future punishment of the wicked is designed for their good, or that their spiritual condition is ever to change after the judgment day. The last information the Bible gives of them is, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment" (Matt. 25, 46), and we have already noted what "everlasting punishment" means. These words—the words of the crucified Christ—the words of the insulted King upon his throne—the words of the Judge of the living and the dead—leaves them in hell; and the words of Holy Writ are entirely silent as to their being purified in that place of torment, and as ascending from the fires of purgatory to the sparkling peaks of the heavenly kingdom. We have already shown in previous articles that the punishment of the wicked is declared, by the authority of the Scriptures, to be everlasting, and is described in such plain, unequivocal terms as to preclude the possibility of its being designed for the good of those who endure it. They are represented as suffering "the wrath," "the vengeance," "the fiery indignation," "the fierceness of the wrath of Almighty God," "judgment without mercy," and all the threatenings of the divine law, with no mixture of good. Does such fearful language as this express fatherly chastisement, or sufferings designed only for the salvation of offenders? See Col. iii. 6; Jude 7; Heb. x. 27; Rev. xix. 16; James ii. 13.

In harmony with the doctrine now under consideration, those who endure temporary punishment in the future world, but are afterward restored to happiness, endure the penalty of the law, or must pass through the crucible of condign punishment. This being so, and the conclusion is inevitable, they never experience salvation at all. *They are not saved by grace divine*, nor by any other kind of grace, nor is their deliverance from punishment in any possible sense to be ascribed to Jesus Christ as the Savior of the world. Hence, as we have heretofore declared, Universalism is deism—rationalism—fatalism—pantheism—and *not* Christianity at all. If sinners are restored to divine favor, the act will be consummated without the mercy or grace of God. They will enter heaven without being under the least obligation to God for having pardoned them, or to the Lord Jesus Christ for having redeemed them. And such stuff as this is palmed off by men as the doctrine of the Bible—by men who “steal the livery of heaven to serve the devil in.”

Again, if the sufferings of the wicked are only necessary and salutary discipline, designed to produce their reformation and promote their ultimate happiness, they are not to be regarded in any proper sense as punishment. Is a man punished who takes medicine to save life, or submits to the amputation of a limb in order to restore health? I have always labored under the impression that punishment is the infliction of positive evil; that it is the subjecting of the guilty to a state of suffering which, all things considered, are an evil *to them*. If then the wicked in the future world suffer only for their good, they are certainly not punished. While enduring the torments of hell, they will have ample occasion for thankfulness and willing submission; because what they endure is only the chastisement of a doting father who is preparing them by this necessary discipline for the purity and happiness of heaven. But my readers can hardly think that hell is a haven of mercy. Where do we read in the Bible that God there makes a display of grace, and that he causes all things to “work together for good,” not to them who *love* him, but to them who *hate* him.

In my next, no preventing providence, I will show that the judgment day is *not* already past, as Universalists claim, and with it examine the 25th chapter of Matthew.

I notice that “Common Sense” is after me again. He has a “point,” and pouts and puckers his mouth, because I don’t lay down my line of argument and pay some attention to his “point.” Poor fellow, he tries to prove Universalism true because the various denominations don’t pull together. It is said that misery loves company. “Common Sense” says, “I have opinions, and am not afraid to state them.” Did you ever! Suppose, for a change, you give us facts and testimony. None but a metaphysician can live long on “opinions.” A theory on mastication, digestion, and assimilation, however beautiful, will not feed a starving man. Bread is what he wants. For the special benefit of “Common Sense,” I will state, by way of philological and logical distinction that a fact is something *done*; that knowledge is that of which I have conscious possession; that faith comes from testimony; that *opinion* means *I think* so and so. His opinion may be right or it may be wrong. Opinions are never received on questions of fact.

And now here comes aid-de-camp No. Three, whose *sobriquet* is

“Compiler.” Verily the thing is getting to be lively if not interesting. But I submit that this Indian style of warfare, that of firing upon an antagonist from behind trees, does not belong to the manly art. “Compiler” intimates strongly that I am avoiding the “Spirit of enquiry” and shielding myself behind a blind and unreasoning faith. Indeed—since when? “Who was the man that declined further investigation?” Who was the man that declined an oral public debate with one of our best men? Who was it that backed down at every point? Your little *ruse*, sir, does not fill the bill. I wish to assure you, dear sir, that neither “Common Sense,” “C. L.” nor “Compiler,” nor all combined, by all your little strategic movements, can decoy me away from my line of argument. However, for variety’s sake, I am in favor of side shows; they serve to supplement and round off things.

JOHN F. ROWE.

## IS THE JUDGMENT DAY PAST?

*To the Editor of the Gazette:*

DEAR SIR: We shall now examine the Scriptures and see whether a *general judgment day* is of *heathen origin*, as has been asserted by rationalistic Universalists. It is assumed, without one direct positive proof of Scripture, that every man is judged and punished in the present life. In order to bolster up this flimsy artifice, all those passages of Scripture are frittered away which speak of a future judgment, and of all men standing before the judgment seat of Christ, and of Christ coming in the glory of his Father, in flaming fire, and with his mighty angels, to judge the world in righteousness. Their manner of wresting and applying the Scriptures proceeds in the following style: “Judas hanged himself: go thou and do likewise: and whatever thou doest, do quickly.” The fact is, the whole system, or theory rather, of Universalism is predicated on a misapplication of Scripture. Instead of making the Bible harmonize with itself, they project a theory, and then torture the Bible to prove the theory, and hence as much of the Bible as seems to prove the theory they adopt, but whatever fails to prove the theory they drop, explain away by “oriental figures” of speech, or entirely reject as spurious or non-inspired.

Touching the subject under consideration, they select a few texts in which the coming of Christ is spoken of with reference to some special manifestation of his power and glory in this world; and immediately, without paying the least respect to the connection, they take the position as demonstrably true, that whenever his coming is mentioned in the Scriptures, it must have the same limitation, and relate only to the scenes in this life. We shall see presently whether the scenes so terribly and graphically described in the Bible have ever been witnessed on earth. A few questions here will be pertinent. Has the Lord Jesus “descended from heaven with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God?” Have the “dead been raised” indeed? Have “the world,” “every man,” “all nations,” “the quick and dead,” “the small and great,” stood before God. Has the Judge of all the earth “separated them one from another, as a shepherd divideth the sheep

from the goats," placing "the sheep on his right hand and the goats on his left." Has he indeed pronounced sentence upon them according to their respective characters, saying to those on his right hand, "Come, you blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world;" and to those on his left, "Depart, you cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels?" And yet bold men stand up in the pulpit and tell the ignorant and credulous multitude that the sentence has actually been executed! Is it so indeed that "the wicked have gone away into everlasting punishment, and the righteous into life eternal?" Is it so that the one are *now* suffering "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power;" and the other "shining forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father?" 1 Thess iv, 16; Rev. xx, 12; Matt. xxv, 31-46; 2 Thess. i, 9; Matt. xiii, 43. These are the wonderful and transcendent scenes which indicate the second coming of Christ—his coming to judge those whom God has "reserved to judgment," and whom he has "reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." And yet men who profess to believe the Bible, have the boldness to declare that these great and momentous events have transpired, and are now transpiring!

The 25th chapter of Matthew is a darling retreat of Universalists. It is at one and the same time their glory and their puzzle—their house of refuge and their Gibraltar—and—their boomerang! Just notice how they interpret it. First, they would have it that by the goats we are to understand the devils; next, the sins of mankind; last of all, neither; but the Jews—yes, the poor and accursed Jews—are the goats, who, about 1800 years ago, were sent into everlasting fire, and have ever since been suffering there with the devil and his angels, who, let it be distinctly noted, according to Universalism, are mere *personifications, nonentities*; and therefore *ex nihilo nihil fit!* All this is about as sharp as when they tell us that the rich man stands for the Aaronic high priest, and the poor, pious beggar for the Gentiles; or that Judas's hanging himself means only that he died by excess of grief, and his going to his own place signifies that he ascended to one of the "twelve thrones" on which the Apostles were to sit, to judge the "twelve tribes of Israel."

It is affirmed that the day of judgment took place at the destruction of Jerusalem. I am curious to know what there was in the destruction of that city that corresponds with the scenes described in the 25th chapter of Matthew. Did the "Son of man" then "come in his glory," and "gather before him *all nations*?" Were all the "holy angels" there? If so, then the Roman legions, fighting under Titus, must have been the angels. Strange kind of angels indeed! Did Titus separate the good angels from the bad angels? Did the great Judge, on that occasion, go into a judicial examination of the characters of the men of "all nations," awarding to the righteous everlasting life, while sending the wicked into everlasting punishment? The man who can believe such palpable nonsense as this is beyond the pale of reason, and evidently belongs to that class of whom Paul wrote when he said that God would "send them strong delusion, that they should (be allowed) to believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness," 2 Thess. ii, 11, 12. That Christ did come, in a gospel and limited sense, in his kingdom on the

day of Pentecost, when the glad tidings of salvation were preached *in his name* for the first time, I do not deny. Christ truly said to his disciples, "There be some standing here that shall not see death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom," Matt. xvi, 28. That is, they shall see the opening of his earthly kingdom, of which the resurrection and the judgment form the close. The 27th verse reads as follows: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." Thus we see that the 28th verse refers to the beginning of that of which the 27th verse speaks of the close. Notice the preceding verses: "Whoever will save his life [that is, his present, temporal life] shall lose it [that is, shall lose that future eternal happiness which is promised to the faithful]. But whoever will lose his life [i. e., will die for Christ's sake] shall find it [shall have eternal life]. For what shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul, or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" Now what is the ruling thought here? Why, *the gaining of the future eternal life by the losing of the present temporal life*. He who loses his life here has the promise of the life beyond; and of this there can be no question, because the "Son of Man will come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then shall he reward every man according to his works." Was *every man* rewarded according to his works at the destruction of Jerusalem? And a singular way General Titus—representing the most cruel nation on all the face of the earth—had of dealing out rewards!

In Acts i, 9, we have this language: "And when he (Christ) had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel, who also said, Why stand you gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus who is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as you have seen him go into heaven." I now ask, has Christ ever come in this literal manner? Where has it ever transpired that Christ came *in the same manner* in which he went up to heaven? Was it at the mount of transfiguration? Was it on the day of Pentecost when the promise of the Father was verified to the new born church? Was it at the destruction of Jerusalem? Did he then *come in the clouds* as he went up into heaven? Did *every eye* see him? Did he bring his reward with him when that white robed angel, Titus, destroyed the city of Jerusalem by the angelic Roman army, and when the angelic soldiers burnt down Solomon's Temple, and carried the Jews captive to the imperial city of Rome? A few streaks of crepuscular light just at this point would be graciously relished.

We have now seen that Christ coming "in his kingdom" is one thing, and his coming in "glory with his angels" quite another thing. I quote the following questions: "When Christ, who is our life (the life of Christians) shall appear, then shall you also appear with him in glory," Col. iii, 4. At this writing the appearing of Christ "in glory" was yet in the future. Paul could not have referred to his "coming in his kingdom," or to the establishment of the kingdom of God, for that was past, as may be seen by reading the 13th verse of the 2d chapter, which says: "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son." The kingdom had come, and Paul and those whom he addressed were in it. But the

appearing "in glory," when he shall come to "judge the world in righteousness," was in the future. Note the force of these words. "Then (at his appearing) shall you appear with him in glory." If the saints have already appeared with Christ in glory, I would like to know when and where. "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by gathering together unto him," 2 Thess. iii, 1. "For our conversation (citizenship) is in heaven: from whence, also, we look for the Savior, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body," Phil. iii, 20, 21. "Beloved, now are we the Sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is," 1 John iii, 2. According to Universalism, all these startling and wonderfull events took place at the destruction of Jerusalem, resurrection, immortality, glory and all! *Credat, Judaeus Apella, Non Ego.* By the way, how does it come to pass, speaking from an eschatological point, that those who profess to believe least in the existence of hell and a personal devil, are the very persons who talk most about these "bugbears." Now I submit the question. Is it possible to talk about a thing or person that never had an existence? A man may talk about an abstraction, it is true, but what was the abstraction abstracted from? An abstraction is some quality of a person or thing that has an actual existence. It is affirmed, contrary to the Word of God, that there is no personal devil, and that the only devil we have is an evil principle. But where did this evil principle come from? Certainly not from God; not from good men; not from inanimate nature. If it emanated from none of these, then it emanated from bad men, and bad men got it from their "father, the devil, who was a liar from the beginning." Consequently children who meditate on the qualities of their Father's character and his abode, are expected to talk a good deal about him. But, I repeat, let any man try to talk about a person or thing that never had an existence.

JOHN F. ROWE.

## THE LAST JUDGMENT.

To the Editor of the Gazette:

DEAR SIR: I continue to write, because your readers are anxious that I should do so; and since my object is to elicit truth, through the medium of your paper, a few columns of which you have so generously surrendered to my use, I beg your further indulgence, as I proceed in my examination of the issues involved in the controversy.

One of the favorite texts on which our Universalist friends rely in support of their proposition that the judgment is past, is the following:

"And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for him he shall appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation." Heb. ix. 27, 28.

It is assumed here by certain critics that the term *tois anthropois*, in the Greek, which represents "men," should have been translated *these men*, meaning the Jewish High Priests, who, by entering the Most Holy Place, died typically, and after this came out from the presence of the Shekinah, and there blessed or approved the people. I propose to

show the utter absurdity of this assumption. *Tois anthropois* should not be translated *these men*, nor *those men*, for the good reason that neither the construction of the Greek language nor the English translation admits of such an interpretation. The word is never so translated any where in the Bible. *Tois* is a Greek article, and it is a wilful torturing of the Greek language, and contrary to all rules of grammar, to translate the article into the adjective form *these* or *those*.

The *dying* here was not figurative; for if it was that, Christ died only a figurative death; because the text reads thus: "So Christ was once offered; that is, offered in the same manner. And if his dying was only figurative, then this was not a real but a figurative sacrifice; and, consequently, he accomplished only a figurative atonement, and, as a result of this, man secures only a figurative salvation! Probably this is one of those "Oriental figures" alluded to by one of my respondents.

But if Christ died a literal death, then the death of the "men" referred to—*tois anthropois*—was also literal; which fact, (according to Ex. 28:35) proves beyond a doubt that it does not signify the High Priest in the Most Holy Place—the law bearing on which reads as follows: "And it shall be upon Aaron to minister; and his sound shall be heard when he goeth into the Holy Place before the Lord, and when he cometh out, that he die not."

In the next place I will show that the High Priest did not typify death at all, by passing through the blue veil into the Most Holy Place, but that by this act typified just exactly the opposite of death. A Sunday-school scholar, ten years of age, could tell us that the High Priest passing into the Holiest of all, was typical of Christ passing through the blue vault of heaven—into the Most Holy Place on High, there, within the veil, to appear before the Mercy Seat, as the "High Priest of our (Christian) profession"—Christ entered into the enjoyment of "an endless life." Thus we see, contrary to the assumption under consideration, that instead of the High Priest dying a typical death when he entered the Holy Place, he represented a typical life. Again: if the fact of the High Priest going into the Most Holy Place, was the dying referred to in the passage, then was the apostle badly mistaken; for, instead of the fact that it was appointed unto *these men once* to die, they were necessitated to die every year; for Paul declares, "Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God; but into the second (the Most Holy Place) went the High Priest alone once every year." Heb. ix, 6, 7. Hence the passage cannot by any possible construction mean the typical death of the High Priest; for, instead of dying *once*, as the text declares, he would be obliged to die thirty times in the course of sixty years, the High Priest having entered office at the age of thirty.

Again: This text cannot have reference to the Jewish High Priest, because after coming out of the Holy Place he *blessed* the waiting people instead of judging them. And so it reads in Leviticus ix, 22, 23, "Aaron lifted up his hands toward the people and *blessed them*, and came down from offering the sin-offering, and Moses and Aaron went into the tabernacle of the Congregation, and came out and *blessed* the people."

If a typical death is what we are to understand by this text, then *tois anthropois* signifies the animals that were slain outside of the camp; for their death typified the death of Christ—the Lamb, mark you—the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world, Christ, as a sin-offering, was slain in the outer court. Hence, instead of saying “men,” as the apostle does, he should have said, in order to harmonize with Universalism, “It is appointed unto these lambs and bullocks *once to die*, and after this be scorched in the fires of purgatory.”

It has been asserted that “the end of the world,” as mentioned by Christ, in Matthew xxiv, 3, is the end of the Jewish age. Whatever this passage may mean, it is certain, as I have already shown, that Christ did not come when Jerusalem was destroyed. The destruction of Jerusalem is never in Scripture called “the end of the world.” The Jewish age ended before the Christian age began. Paul lived in the Christian age, and hence he said the ends of the ages [the latter end of the Jewish and the beginning of the Christian] came upon him and his contemporaries. See 1 Cor. x, 11. Christ was crucified at the end of the Jewish age. Hence, says Paul: “But now once in the end of the world *hath he appeared* to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” Heb. ix, 26. When Christ died, the Jewish theocracy was at an end; when He ascended and sent down the Holy Spirit, the Christian age began.

It is freely admitted that from the 15th verse of the chapter (Matt. xxiv) to the 22d, inclusive, Christ speaks of “these things”—that is, the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple. And having described that remarkable event, at the 23d verse he says: “*Then* (at the destruction of the city) if any man shall say to you, Lo, here is Christ, or there, *believe it not.*” Did Christ come in person and in glory at that time? Let Christ answer for himself: “For (this reason) there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; inasmuch that if it were possible they would deceive the very elect.” Josephus tells us that there was no end to the number of men pretending to be Christ about that time. But we shall hear further from the true Christ: “Behold, I have told you before; wherefore if they shall say to you, Behold he is in the desert; go not forth; Behold, he is in the secret chambers; BELIEVE IT NOT. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, *so* shall also the coming of the Son of Man be.” Verses 26, 27. This means that “every eye shall see Him” when He comes—and that all shall *know* when He comes. But, as if to render his meaning more clear and forcible, He proceeds to say: “For wheresoever the carcass is, there shall the eagles be gathered together.” When Christ comes, shall be “gathered together” unto Him. Paul said to the Christians at Thessalonica: “Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto Him.” And to the Colossians: “When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall you also appear with Him in glory.” Did these Christians appear in glory with Christ at the destruction of Jerusalem? History informs us that what few Christians remained were scattered among the hills of Judea; but of these, none were from Thessalonica or Colosse.

But let us pursue the investigation a little further in the 24th chapter of Matthew. Beginning at the 29th verse we read:

‘Immediately after the tribulation of these days, shall the sun be dark-

ened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken; and then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.”

Having just informed His disciples that they must not expect Him at the destruction of Jerusalem, He now gives them to understand that the “sign” of His coming shall appear in heaven “*after* the tribulation of those days.” The “sign” was to precede His coming, but even that was not to appear till “*after* the tribulation” that was to be brought on the Jewish nation, and which was predicted by the prophet Daniel, and quoted by Christ as “the abomination of desolation”—the Roman legions—standing in the Sanctuary of the Holy City. After describing the overthrow of the City, which was to the Jews only “the beginning of sorrows,” Christ says, “And they shall fall by the edge of the sword; and they shall be led away captive *into all nations*; and Jerusalem shall be trodden underfoot of the Gentiles, *until the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled.*” (Luke XXI, 24.) The Jews are *still* dispersed “among all nations.” Jerusalem is *still* “trodden underfoot of the Gentiles;” “The times of the Gentiles” are *not yet* “fulfilled.” And, therefore, according to this chapter, the coming of Christ is yet future, and is to occur “*after* the tribulation of those days.” “*Then shall all the tribes of the earth* mourn, and they (all the tribes of the earth) shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And He shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together His elect from the four winds, from *one end of heaven to the other.*” This evidently means the resurrection of the dead. In connection with this let us quote the language of Paul in 1 Thess. iv. 15—18:

“For this we say to you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain to the coming of the Lord, shall not go before them who are asleep, (in their graves.) For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore, comfort one another with these words.”

But to evade the force of all these passages, the Universalists will quote the 32d verse of Luke XXI, which reads as follows: “This *generation* shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled.” This word, *genea*, means also according to the best Greek lexicons, “birth,” “descent,” “race,” “blood,” as its primary meaning, while “lifetime,” or “the people living at any one time,” are given as secondary meanings. The evident meaning of the passage is, that this Jewish *race*, this *distinct* people, shall not pass away until all these things be fulfilled. The Jews still remain a distinct race of people, a fact which is intensified by the prophecy of Jeremiah, (xxxi. 36,) which reads: “If those ordinances (the sun, moon and stars) depart from before me, then the seed of Israel shall also cease from being a *nation before me forever.*” Although the Jews lost their *political* nationality, they have never lost their *identity* as a distinct race. This fact of itself is a standing miracle which no infidel can overthrow. According to the proph-

ecy, and if we may judge by the signs of the times, the Jews as a distinct nation will, ere long, re-possess their native land.

There are two senses in which the word *judgment* is used, and these must not be confounded. In the one case judgment means "wisdom and prudence, enabling a person to discern right and wrong, good and evil." To show the difference I will quote two passages of Scripture. And first: "And Jesus said, For judgment I am come into this world; that they who see not might see, and that they who see might be made blind," John ix, 39. And second: "And if an man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world," John xii, 47. We dare not make Christ contradict himself. In the first instance he came to "set judgment in the earth," that the people, through the gospel, might have "wisdom to discern right and wrong." To this agree the words of Christ, as he quotes them from Isaiah: "Behold my servant whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased; I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall *show* judgment to the Gentiles," Matt. xii, 18. But the other passage certainly refers to the future judgment. The contrast is made very strong when Christ says, "If any man hear my words, and believe not, I (*now*) judge him not; for I came *not* to judge the world (in the sense of condemning), but to save the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same *shall* judge him *at the last day*. For he hath appointed *a day* in which he *will* judge the world in righteousness." And this is the day of which Paul speaks, after he had finished his course, and was about ready to be offered up, and which he placed beyond death: "There is *laid up* for me (who am *now* ready to be offered) a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, *shall* give me *at that day*."

If, as Universalists assert, the judgment is already past, then, as a sequence, from the premises, all the heaven we shall ever have is here, and hell is here, and future glory and immortality are but the baseless fabric of dream, a mirage upon the desert waste of a fruitless life!

If, by the examination of the Scriptures, I have not harmonized the teaching of Christ and his apostles, as touching this proposition, and have not demonstrated the fallacy of the reasoning of the opposite side, I here confess that I do not understand the rules of evidence, nor comprehend the meaning of analysis and synthesis. The subject will be continued.

JOHN F. ROWE.

---

P. S.—I see by your last issue that this theological discussion must "close." Not anticipating that you would shut down so suddenly, and having prepared this article as the conclusion of a previous article, I hope, sir, you will allow the publication of this as my final act in this theological drama. It would, however, be a pleasure to continue it; but I submit to the inevitable.

J. F. R.